356 and 360) probably do not belong to this work, being merely incidental references which might occur by way of illustration in any other writing as well as in a professedly historical one; one (No. 416) belongs to the mutilated section on the law-courts, if it is from this work at all; while one (No. 358) is apparently a misquotation (due probably to a scribe) of a passage in the MS. Thus of the total number of ninety-one fragments (of which eighty-five or eighty-six are probably genuine references to this work), seventy-eight are found in the MS. in its present condition, and all the rest, with only one clear exception, are accounted for. It may be added that the passages discovered on some papyrus fragments at Berlin by Blass and identified as portions of the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία by Bergk (see *Hermes*, XV. 366, *Rhein. Mus.* XXXVI. 87, *Berl. Akad. Abhandl.* 1885) are found in this MS., though Rose disputed the accuracy of Bergk's identification (*Aristotelis Fragmenta*, ed. 1886, pp. 260, 270). References are given in the notes to the fragments as they occur in the MS., and those which do not so occur are added in an Appendix.

It may therefore be taken for certain that we have here the work which was known and cited in antiquity as ἡ τῶν Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία. Whether it is a genuine work of Aristotle's is another question. The subject of the Aristotelian canon is a difficult one, and must be left to those who are specialists in it; but the following facts are clear in relation to the present treatise. The Πολιτεῖαι, of which this was the most important section, is included in the lists of Aristotle's works given by Diogenes Laertius, Hesychius, and Ptolemy (the latter being known only in an Arabic version). It is true that Valentine Rose, whose thorough study of the remains of Aristotle is indisputable, considers the works named in those lists to be composed not by Aristotle but by obscurer members of the Peripatetic school (*Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus*, 1863); but this ex-

treme view, which is in itself improbable, is rejected by Heitz (*Die verlorenen Schriften des Aristoteles*, 1865), Grote, and most other competent critics. No doubt several spurious treatises may be included in the lists, but there is no sufficient ground for rejecting them in the main; and the position of the Πολιτεῖαι is stronger than that of most of the doubtful works. From internal evidence it is certain that it must have been composed before 307 B.C., for the author in describing the constitution of Athens in his own day speaks always of ten tribes, which number was increased to twelve in the year just mentioned. On the other hand the date 329 B.C. is incidentally referred to in ch. 54, and in speaking of the two sacred triremes in ch. 61 the name Ammonias is used in place of the Salaminia. This change of name (see note *ad loc.*) must have been made during the reign of Alexander, who claimed to be the son of Ammon, and out of respect for whom offerings were no doubt sent to the temple of Ammon in Egypt. This work was therefore written, or at least revised, at the earliest in the last seven years of Aristotle's life, and at the latest in the fifteen years after his death[1]. We know further from a quotation in Polybius that Timaeus, who died about the middle of the third

[1] [Other scholars have narrowed the limits required by the internal evidence. Keil and Pais have pointed out that the division of functions among the strategi mentioned in ch. 61 had not been made in 334 B.C., and the former adds that the foreign possessions of Athens are in ch. 62 limited to Samos, Scyros, Lemnos, and Imbros, which was the state of things established by the peace of Demades in 338 B.C. These dates go to show that the date 329 B.C. mentioned in ch. 54 is not due to a later revision of the work. On the other hand Weil and others show that the changes introduced by Antipater after the Lamian war are not mentioned, which indicates that the work was composed before 322 B.C., the year of Aristotle's death. Further, Mr. C. Torr argues from the fact that quadriremes are mentioned in ch. 46 (see note *ad loc.*), but not quinqueremes, that it must have been written before 325 B.C. The date of the treatise is consequently clearly fixed for the years 328–326 B.C., inclusive. The argument for Aristotelian authorship may therefore be strengthened by affirming that the work was certainly written in his lifetime.]

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΟΥΣ

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ

Oxford
PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
BY HORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ

ARISTOTLE

ON THE

CONSTITUTION OF ATHENS

EDITED BY

F. G. KENYON, M.A.
FELLOW OF MAGDALEN COLLEGE, OXFORD
ASSISTANT IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MANUSCRIPTS, BRITISH MUSEUM

THIRD AND REVISED EDITION

PRINTED BY ORDER OF THE TRUSTEES OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM
SOLD AT THE MUSEUM
AND BY LONGMANS AND Co., 39 PATERNOSTER ROW
B. QUARITCH, 15 PICCADILLY; ASHER AND Co., 13 BEDFORD STREET, COVENT GARDEN
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER AND Co., 57 LUDGATE HILL, LONDON
ALSO BY HENRY FROWDE, CLARENDON PRESS DEPÔT, OXFORD
1892

PREFACE

THE first edition of Aristotle's Constitution of Athens was published in January 1891, and the second, which was little more than a reprint, almost immediately followed. The third edition, now issued, has been carefully revised and corrected throughout.

EDWARD SCOTT,

Keeper of MSS.

BRITISH MUSEUM,
25th January, 1892.

INTRODUCTION
TO THE FIRST EDITION[1]

WHEN Neumann in 1827 edited the Fragments of the Πολιτεῖαι of Aristotle he lamented, not unnaturally, 'eheu amissum est in sempiternum praeclarum opus, nisi e palimpsestis quibusdam fortasse eruatur.' The field which now shows the greatest promise of restoring to us some of the lost works of antiquity had then hardly been opened up at all, and there was little sign that Egypt might still return to the modern world some of the treasures which were committed to her by the ancient. Since that date discoveries of no little value have been made among the papyri which have from time to time been brought to Europe and are now preserved in the great libraries of England and the Continent. Several papyrus MSS. of parts of the Iliad, dating from the first century before the Christian era to the fourth or fifth after it, are now known to the world, which, though they have not affected the text of Homer in any appreciable degree, are yet of interest as carrying back the tradition of it for many centuries before the earliest MS. that was previously known. Fragments of Thucydides, Plato, Euripides, Isocrates, Demosthenes, and other classical authors have been discovered, which,

[1] [This Introduction is reprinted with verbal alterations and a few omissions. Some notes have been added, which are distinguished from those which appeared in the first edition by being enclosed between square brackets.]

while not of any great importance in themselves, were hopeful signs of the discoveries which might be expected in the future. More than this, there have been one or two finds of works hitherto completely lost, and these are of course the great treasures of the papyrus literature. They include a mutilated fragment of Alcman, now at Paris (quoted in Mahaffy's *Greek Literature*, vol. I. p. 172), and several orations of Hyperides, all of which (with the exception of one lately reported by M. Revillout to be in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris) are preserved in the British Museum[1]. The British Museum has now the satisfaction of publishing the latest and most important addition to the extant stock of classical Greek literature, the often-quoted but hitherto lost Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία of Aristotle.

None of the lost works of Aristotle is so much quoted by the writers of the early centuries of the Christian era as the Πολιτεῖαι, which, containing as it did a summary of the political constitutions of a hundred and fifty-eight states of all kinds, was a storehouse of historical information for subsequent ages. The portion relating to Athens, together with those relating to Corinth and Pellene, may possibly (though this is doubtful) have been in the library of Cicero

[1] To the discoveries here mentioned should now be added the very interesting fragments of Plato and Euripides which have been found by Professors Sayce and Mahaffy among the papyri brought from Egypt by Mr. Flinders Petrie. Apart from the fact that they include a portion of the lost *Antiope* of Euripides, they are considerably the earliest classical MSS. at present known to us, dating (according to the Professors' letters in the *Academy* of Oct. 11th, and the *Athenaeum* of Oct. 25th and Dec. 6th, 1890) from the third century B.C. Further, the British Museum has recently acquired several classical papyri, among which, in addition to some interesting early fragments of Homer, Demosthenes, and Isocrates, is the conclusion of a speech which may perhaps be ascribed to Hyperides, and also several of the lost poems of the iambographer Herodas. [These texts have since been printed, the Petrie papyri in *Cunningham Memoirs, No. VIII*, edited by Dr. Mahaffy and published by the Royal Irish Academy, and the British Museum MSS. in *Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum*, published by the Trustees of the British Museum.]

(*ad Att.* II. 2); it is quoted by Plutarch in the first century of the Christian era; it was largely used by Pollux in the second; its name occurs in a catalogue of a library in the third (Zündel in *Rhein. Mus.* 1866, p. 432); in the fourth it is repeatedly cited by Harpocration; in the sixth we know, on the evidence of Photius, that it was used by the rhetorician Sopater[1]. On the other hand Photius himself, three centuries afterwards, does not seem to have known the work otherwise than in quotations by earlier writers; and any references to it in grammarians and compilers of later date are probably made at second hand. Between the sixth and the ninth century it disappeared and was seen no more until in this nineteenth century it has once more been brought to light. The treatise on Athens was naturally the part which was of most interest to the scholars of the Greek world after the date of Aristotle, which was most frequently quoted in their works, and which was no doubt most frequently copied; and it is therefore not surprising that this, rather than any other portion of the work, should have been preserved from the library of an Egyptian scholar of one of the early centuries of the Christian era. Tastes will differ as to whether we could have wished some other lost work of Greek literature to have been returned to us rather than this. Some might have preferred an addition to our stock of poetry, in a new tragedy of Aeschylus or of Euripides, to have recovered another play of Aristophanes or to have broken fresh ground with a specimen of the New Comedy of Menander. Others might wish that, if the discovery were to be historical, it might be an Ephorus by which we might check the accuracy of Plutarch, or a Theopompus to throw light on

[1] Heitz and Rose believe all these quotations from Aristotle to be taken at second hand from the compilations of Didymus or other early writers, and that the work of Aristotle was lost at a very early date. As we now know that the latter was not the case, their arguments for the most part fall to the ground.

the obscure details of the period of Alexander. But if it were to be an additional authority on the period which we already know comparatively well, but in which much still remains in obscurity and open to conjecture, no work could be named of equal value and authority with Aristotle's Constitutional History of Athens.

A short description of the MS. is necessary, in order to understand the state in which the text has come down to us. It is imperfect at the beginning; but this appears to be due to the first chapters never having been written (probably because the MS. from which this was copied was imperfect or illegible in that part), and not to the subsequent loss of any part of the papyrus; for a blank space has been left before the first column of writing, which was no doubt intended to receive the beginning of the work. The latter portion of the MS. has, however, suffered severely; but the fortunate fact that another document (of which more is said below) is written on the other side of the papyrus enables us to estimate with tolerable accuracy the extent of the mutilation. There are four separate lengths of papyrus, which no doubt were originally distinct rolls. The first of these is complete, or nearly so (the only doubt being as to whether a larger space was left blank to receive the commencement of the work than now remains), and measured, when acquired by the Museum, 7 ft. 2½ in. in length. It has since been divided, for convenience of mounting, into two pieces measuring 4 ft. 2½ in. and 3 ft. respectively. This roll contains eleven broad columns of writing; the later ones are in good condition, but the earlier ones are badly rubbed and often very difficult to decipher. The second roll measures 5 ft. 5½ in., and contains thirteen much narrower columns, in fairly good condition throughout. The third measures 3 ft., and contains six broad columns, which have been put together from a large number of fragments; but one of these is

very imperfect, and there are several other small lacunas in this part of the papyrus. The fourth roll is purely fragmentary; its original length may be estimated, partly by the help of the writing on the other side of the papyrus, at 3 ft., but no column except the last remains perfect, and the writing is miserably defaced and in many places quite illegible. The height of the papyrus is throughout about 11 inches, except in the fourth roll, which measures rather less than 10 in., and which, as appears from the matter on the other side, was taken from a different piece of papyrus.

The text is written in four hands. The first is a small semi-cursive hand, employing a large number of abbreviations of common syllables, such as *την*, *της*, *περι*, *και* (see list at end of Introduction). The writing is not that of a professional scribe, but is on the whole very correct and easy to read wherever the papyrus has not been badly rubbed. This hand includes the first twelve columns[1], which vary in width from 4½ to 11 inches, each containing from forty-three to forty-eight lines of close writing. The second hand is uncial of fair size, written in a plain but not very graceful style, and with habitual mis-spellings and mistakes which show that the writer was not a scholar nor a well-educated person. Many of the mistakes are corrected in the first hand, which suggests that the writer of that hand was a scholar who desired a copy of Aristotle's work for his own library, while the writer of the second was a slave or professional scribe employed by him to complete the transcript. Columns thirteen to twenty are written in this hand; they are much narrower than the preceding

[1] The sequence of these columns is broken after the middle of the tenth, by a column and a half of writing in the reverse direction, which had evidently been inscribed on the papyrus before the Aristotle, but was struck out when the sheet was required for the latter. The hand is not the same as any of those of the Aristotle, but is apparently of the same date. [For a description and transcript of its contents see Appendix II].

columns, measuring only 3 to 4½ inches in breadth and containing forty-four to fifty-one lines. In the third hand are written half the twentieth column and columns twenty-one to twenty-four, together with the much damaged fragments of the fourth roll of the MS. This hand is semi-cursive, but much larger and more straggling than the first hand. The fourth hand, in which are written the six columns of which the third roll consists, closely resembles the first, and employs many of the same abbreviations, but the strokes are somewhat finer and more upright and some of the letters are differently formed[1].

[1] [The German editors of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, Professors Kaibel and von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, express the opinion in their preface (pp. v, vi) that only two scribes took part in the MS., identifying the second and third hands, and the first and fourth. With this view it is impossible to agree. As regards the second and third hands they argue that the only difference is that the scribe became careless and lapsed into cursive, returning to uncial just at the conclusion of the fourth roll. But, apart from the difference of general appearance between the writings here distinguished as the second and third hands, a comparison of the uncials of col. 37 with those of cols. 13–20 shows that they cannot be by the same scribe. The former are rough, coarse, and ugly; the latter, if not very graceful, are neat and careful. Still less is it the case that the scribe at the end of the second roll (col. 24) returns to the style of the second hand. Moreover, the change of hands in col. 20 (after the letters εβη in l. 28) is not at first a change from uncial to cursive. The letters continue for a few lines to be separately formed, as though the new scribe wished to maintain uniformity with his predecessor, but he uses a lighter pen, and forms his letters (notably υ) differently. Further, the orthographic characteristics of the hands are different. While the second hand writes ι for ει continually (van Leeuwen gives forty-one instances, besides those which have been subsequently corrected), the third hand does so only four times; *per contra*, the fourth hand writes ει for ι sixteen times, the third only eleven times, of which five occur in the same word ελευσεινοθεν.

As to the first and fourth hands, superficial observation shows a likeness and a difference,—a likeness in the use of contractions and in general formation of letters, a difference in size and thickness of characters, the first hand being consistently thicker and larger than the fourth. If fanciful speculation were admissible, the resemblance and the difference are such as one sees in the handwritings of two members of the same family. Closer examination confirms the difference. Several letters are differently formed; notably the peculiar ╕-shaped η, which is characteristic of the first hand, is never found in the fourth. Similarly the first hand has ordinarily a y-shaped υ (Ⴑ), while the fourth consistently has the v-shape. ζ is generally flatter and squarer in the fourth than

The condition of the writing varies considerably in different places. The earlier columns are badly rubbed, especially at the places where the roll was folded, and the writing is often either absolutely illegible or discernible only with great difficulty. In some cases, however, where the letters are not in themselves legible there are yet sufficient traces to verify or to condemn a conjectural restoration of the text. This is the case with many passages which have been restored in the printed text, and in some which still await conjectural emendation. Except in these earlier columns the writing is generally in fair condition. In the greater part of the MS. holes in the papyrus are rare; but the six columns of the third roll have been put together, as has been already said, out of many different fragments, and large gaps still remain, in one place amounting to a considerable part of a column, in which case restoration is naturally for the most part impossible. The text, apart from difficulties of decipherment, is in good condition and requires little emendation [1],

in the first hand, and κ is sharper and more angular. Further, there are differences in the use of abbreviations. A reference to the statistics in van Leeuwen's *observationes palaeographicae* (in the Dutch edition of the 'Α.π.) confirms the general impression to this effect. σ′ and π′ are used frequently by the first hand, rarely by the fourth; μ\` only by the first, α\` and υ\` only by the fourth. The symbol for *χρόνος* is found only in the first hand. The termination *-σθαι* is written by the first hand as σθ, by the fourth as σθ′. The final syllables *-ος*, *-ον*, *-οι*, *-ου*, *-οις*, *-ους*, are constantly indicated in the first hand by an *ο* above the line, but only twice by the fourth hand, which prefers abbreviating by placing the preceding consonant above the line. The first hand is also fond of representing *-ων* and *-ως* by an *ω* above the line, which the fourth hand does rarely in the first case, never in the second. Finally, the first hand places the sign of diaeresis over *ι* and *υ* twenty times, the fourth only once. Differences such as these forbid us to identify the writers of these two hands, even apart from the impression produced by a study of their general appearances, which is easier to feel than to explain.]

[1] [A critic has taken exception to this statement by referring to the very large number of conjectures that have been proposed since the appearance of the first edition. But, apart from the fact that a conjecture made is not the same as an emendation necessary, he has omitted to notice how many of these conjectures refer to passages in which the MS. reading is doubtful. It was of

beyond the correction of the somewhat uncultured spelling of the second and third hands.

It remains to estimate the date of the MS. The palaeography of the first centuries of the Christian era is still so uncertain, owing to the want of dated materials, that it would be difficult to fix it with any accuracy by the writing alone. Fortunately there are other means at hand. The text of Aristotle is written on the reverse side[1] of the papyrus, and on the *recto* are accounts of receipts and expenditure which are dated in the eleventh year of Vespasian, of which a specimen is given with the facsimile of the Πολιτεία (Plate 22)[2]. The dating of this document presents some points of interest. The heading at the beginning of it (which is to be found on the second of the pieces into which the first roll of papyrus is now divided, its text running in the contrary direction to that of the Aristotle) is as follows: *Ετους ενδεκατου αυτοκρατορος Καισαρος Ουεσπασιανου Σεβαστου αργυρικος λογος Επιμαχου Πολυδευκους λημματων και ανηλωματων των δι εμου Διδυμου Ασπασιου χειριζομενων, ων ειναι λημμ̈ του μηνος Σεβαστου.* The names of the months for which the accounts are given succeed one another in the following order, *Σεβαστου, Φαωφι, Νεου Σεβαστου, Χοιαχ, Τυβι, Μεχειρ, Φαμενωθ, Φαρμουθι, Παχων.* The remarkable feature here is the occurrence of the names Σεβαστός and Νέος Σεβαστός in the place of Thouth and Athur respectively. The former does not seem to have been observed elsewhere in Egyptian documents; but one of the Archduke Rainer's Papyri is dated *μηνος*

course not meant that the MS. was as accurately written as the best vellum MSS., but among papyrus MSS. it appears to hold a good character, and should not be treated as a schoolboy's exercise.]

[1] *I. e.* that side on which the fibres of the papyrus are laid perpendicularly (*cf.* Wilcken's article *Recto oder Verso*, in *Hermes*, Vol. XXII).

[2] The text of these accounts, which are those of the bailiff of a private estate, will be printed in the *Catalogue of Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, which is now passing through the press.

Σεβαστου Αθυρ πεμπτη (Pap. No. 1717, *cf. Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer*, pt. II. p. 16, 1887). The name Σεβαστός is of course equivalent to August; but it is noticeable that it was given in Egypt to the month Thouth, which began on Aug. 29th, rather than to Mesore, which occupied the greater part of the Roman month of August. Athur was no doubt re-named in honour of Vespasian, who was born in that month. As to the year named, Vespasian was proclaimed emperor at Alexandria in July, 69 A.D. The Egyptian year began with Thouth, and according to the usual mode of dating in that country his second year would be reckoned to begin with the Thouth next following his proclamation, *i.e.* at the end of August in the same year 69 A.D. His eleventh year would therefore be that which began in August of 78 A.D.; and in the following June he died. The entries of the present document extend to the preceding month, Pachon in the Egyptian calendar beginning on April 26th. The writing on the *recto* of the papyrus consequently belongs to 78–79 A.D.[1] We cannot tell how soon afterwards the *verso* was used for receiving the text of Aristotle, but on the one hand it is not likely to have been so used while the accounts on the *recto* were still valuable, and on the other the papyrus is not likely to have continued unused and undestroyed for very many years after the accounts had ceased to be of interest. Moreover some of the most remarkable forms of letters and abbreviations which occur in the Aristotle are also found in the accounts. The date of the Aristotle may therefore be fixed with some certainty

[1] It may be noted that writing of a very similar character is found in other papyri of which the date has hitherto been a matter of pure conjecture (*e.g.* Papyri XCIX, CIX, and CXIX in the British Museum), but which may now be safely assigned to some part of the second century. Another British Museum papyrus (CXXV *recto*), which cannot be earlier than the middle of the fourth century, shows how far this style of writing had degenerated by that time.

of prosperity from commerce which was the best security against the repetition of such drastic measures as the σεισάχθεια.

The economic pressure being lightened, he proceeded to deal with the political constitution. In the first place all existing laws, except those relating to murder, were repealed, so as to give the reformer a clear field on which to reconstruct the constitution according to his own ideas. He then proceeded to take a completely new basis for the organisation of the state. There was already in existence a classification of the people according to their property, which was no doubt used for purposes of taxation. This Solon adopted for his political purposes, and according to a man's position in one or other of these four classes, such was his share in the government of the country. The highest offices, such as the archonship and the stewardship of the treasury, were reserved for the Pentacosiomedimni. The Hippeis and the Zeugitae were eligible for minor magistracies; while those who were classed as Thetes, among whom was included the whole mass of the unskilled labourers of the country, received a voice in the Ecclesia and a seat in the law-courts by which the conduct of outgoing magistrates was reviewed at the conclusion of their term of office. The revolution was great, and even greater in potentiality than in immediate result. The qualification of birth was swept away and the qualification of property substituted. The election of magistrates was established on a popular basis, being given primarily to the tribes, ultimately to the lot. Thus in electing the archons the four tribes each elected ten candidates, and from the forty names thus submitted nine were chosen by lot. The Ecclesia, in which these elections were probably conducted, grew in importance, though still it is not likely that it exercised any perceptible control over the general management of public affairs.

The Council of Draco was re-established, with the odd member struck off, making the total four hundred. By these measures, and by the general improvement in the position of the lower orders, the powers of the Areopagus were curtailed, but it still remained, as Aristotle expressly says, the guardian of the laws and of the state, with a general supervision of both public and private life, and a power of inflicting summary punishment.

The constitution of Solon, though in many points he was only following his predecessor Draco, was rightly regarded in later times as the origin of the democracy of Athens. The labouring class was for the first time given a voice in the government, and was taught to look upon itself as having the right to review, and if necessary to censure, the conduct of affairs by the magistrates whom it had itself elected. The popular assembly became for the first time the representative of the collective voice of the whole people, though a long course of political training was necessary before the classes newly admitted to the franchise were capable of exercising to any important extent the powers thus committed to them. The constitution of Solon was a great and memorable achievement, not so much for what it immediately accomplished as for its indication of the lines along which the Athenian democracy was to develop.

At the moment, indeed, it gave little satisfaction to anyone. The poorer classes had had their hopes and their cupidity excited by the long agitation which preceded the reforms; and though in fact they were gainers every way by the new legislation, for the moment they were disappointed because there had not been a general redistribution of the soil of the country, which would have given them a slice of their neighbours' property without labour and without cost. The aristocracy had more reason to be discontented with an arrangement which

treme view, which is in itself improbable, is rejected by Heitz (*Die verlorenen Schriften des Aristoteles*, 1865), Grote, and most other competent critics. No doubt several spurious treatises may be included in the lists, but there is no sufficient ground for rejecting them in the main; and the position of the Πολιτεῖαι is stronger than that of most of the doubtful works. From internal evidence it is certain that it must have been composed before 307 B.C., for the author in describing the constitution of Athens in his own day speaks always of ten tribes, which number was increased to twelve in the year just mentioned. On the other hand the date 329 B.C. is incidentally referred to in ch. 54, and in speaking of the two sacred triremes in ch. 61 the name Ammonias is used in place of the Salaminia. This change of name (see note *ad loc.*) must have been made during the reign of Alexander, who claimed to be the son of Ammon, and out of respect for whom offerings were no doubt sent to the temple of Ammon in Egypt. This work was therefore written, or at least revised, at the earliest in the last seven years of Aristotle's life, and at the latest in the fifteen years after his death [1]. We know further from a quotation in Polybius that Timaeus, who died about the middle of the third

[1] [Other scholars have narrowed the limits required by the internal evidence. Keil and Pais have pointed out that the division of functions among the strategi mentioned in ch. 61 had not been made in 334 B. C., and the former adds that the foreign possessions of Athens are in ch. 62 limited to Samos, Scyros, Lemnos, and Imbros, which was the state of things established by the peace of Demades in 338 B. C. These dates go to show that the date 329 B. C. mentioned in ch. 54 is not due to a later revision of the work. On the other hand Weil and others show that the changes introduced by Antipater after the Lamian war are not mentioned, which indicates that the work was composed before 322 B. C., the year of Aristotle's death. Further, Mr. C. Torr argues from the fact that quadriremes are mentioned in ch. 46 (see note *ad loc.*), but not quinqueremes, that it must have been written before 325 B. C. The date of the treatise is consequently clearly fixed for the years 328–326 B. C., inclusive. The argument for Aristotelian authorship may therefore be strengthened by affirming that the work was certainly written in his lifetime.]

broken men 'and every one that was distressed, and every one that was in debt, and every one that was discontented' in every class of society.

But a fresh turn was given to affairs in 581 B.C., when an attempt was made to overthrow the constitution and establish a tyranny in its place. Damasias, who had been archon in the previous year, contrived to be continued in office during this year also. We are not told on what pretext this was effected, and the fact does not appear to have aroused alarm. But when the time came for new archons to enter into office in 580 B.C., and Damasias still showed no signs of abandoning his position, it was clear that his intention was to establish himself as a despot. Against this danger all parties of the state united, and as the would-be tyrant had neglected to provide himself with the only trustworthy support of a despotism, a paid military force, he was expelled from his position within two months after the completion of his second year of office. It then became necessary to provide for the government of the country during the remainder of the year, and as all parties had combined in the expulsion of the tyrant, all had a right to have their claims to consideration respected in the matter. The old aristocracy could not reasonably exclude the representatives of the other classes from a share in the government, but on the other hand they thought it a good opportunity to abolish the Solonian property-qualification which refused to recognise the claims of birth. Accordingly they reverted to the older division of classes, and drew up a board of ten, of which half was reserved to the Eupatridae, while three representatives were assigned to the Geomori and two to the Demiurgi. But this arrangement does not seem to have given satisfaction, for we hear nothing of its being continued beyond the year for which it was created, and we must presume that the Solonian system then returned into force.

column does not contain the beginning of the work, which is wanting. The second and third both occur in the middle of a subject, in the one case the constitution of the Four Hundred, in the other the duties of the βουλή. Again, in no citation of the treatise in any ancient author is there any indication of its having been divided into sections. One manuscript of Harpocration does indeed read ἐν τῇ α' Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ (*Frag.* 378), but even if the reading is correct it is only on a level with ἐν τῇ Ἰθακησίων πολιτείᾳ μβ' in Photius (*Frag.* 466), implying that the Athenian constitution stood first in Aristotle's list of states, while that of Ithaca was forty-second. The purpose of the letters in the MS. is quite different. In each case they stand at the beginning of one of the rolls of papyrus of which the whole MS. is composed, and there is no doubt that they are simply intended to indicate the order in which these rolls follow one another. Probably the person who added them (or rather the first two of them, since the third is in a different hand) did not observe that the beginning of the work is wanting, when he wrote the first of them above the first column of the MS., taking no notice of the blank space that precedes it, which was no doubt intended to receive the missing portion of the work; but this might easily be the case, as this same blank space naturally gives the column which follows it the appearance of being the beginning of a work. As there is no trace of writing on this blank space, it may be taken for certain that the beginning was, for some reason or another, never written, and the MS. consequently begins with an incomplete sentence.

The subject of the treatise is the Constitutional History of Athens, and it falls into two sections. The first, which is the most interesting, contains a historical account of the development of the constitution from the earliest times to the re-establishment of the democracy after the expulsion

proved greater than his. Pisistratus was driven into exile, and for four years he had no chance of a return. Then the cards of party were shuffled anew, Megacles the leader of the Alcmeonidae and Pisistratus made friends, and the latter was re-established in the tyranny as the husband of his ally's daughter. Still, however, he had not learnt the only way in which a despotism could be made secure, and when a quarrel with his father-in-law threw the latter once more into alliance with Lycurgus and the party of the Plain, he had no choice but to escape while there was time, lest a worse thing happen to him. His second period of government had lasted about six years, but he had nearly twice that length of time to pass in exile. This time he learned his lesson thoroughly. He settled for some years in the rich metalliferous districts about the Strymon and Mount Pangaeus, and with the money which he derived thence he hired mercenaries and allies, and when about 535 B.C. he came back to Athens, he came to stay. His last period of government was not indeed very much longer than his other two, lasting apparently for about eight years, but it was of a very different kind. Before he had never been certain of his seat and was dependent on the precarious support of political rivals. This time he was firm in the saddle, and when he died at a good old age in 527 B.C. he left the quiet possession of the kingdom to his sons.

Of the government of the tyrants at Athens there is not much that is new to be said. It is agreed on all hands that the administration of Pisistratus was mild and beneficent, so that, as Aristotle expressly mentions, men recalled it afterwards as the Golden Age. The principle of the policy of Pisistratus was to keep the people employed and to keep them contented. To these ends law was administered equally and fairly, capital was provided to encourage agriculture and commerce, public works were

The beginning of the work, as has been said before, is lost. The MS. opens with the conclusion of the narrative of the conspiracy of Cylon and of its consequences in the way of the expulsion of the Alcmeonidae and the purification of the city by Epimenides of Crete. The direct narrative of the period of the kings is therefore wanting; but a summary of the constitution as it existed before the reforms of Draco throws some light on the earlier history of Athens. This is especially the case with the period known as the rule of the Medontidae. On the death of Codrus, as has been universally agreed, some modification took place in the position of the kingship. The house of Codrus remained upon the throne, and its representatives governed for life, and the title of king (contrary to the popular tradition) continued to be given to them; but their power was modified in various ways. In the first place it is probable that the king was elective. The choice was indeed confined to the kingly house of the Medontidae; but the Eupatrid aristocracy, through its organ the Areopagus, selected the member of it who should represent the rest during his life. Further, with the king two other officers of considerable importance were associated, the Polemarch and the Archon. Of these the Polemarch was the successor of the commander-in-chief who, from the time of the legendary Ion, had been associated with the more unwarlike kings; but the Archon was a new creation at the accession of either Medon or Acastus. The duties of the Archon are undefined, but it is clear that these two magistrates formed some check on the autocratic government of the kings. Meanwhile the Areopagus, which had at first no doubt been a body of advisers nominated by the king from the families of the aristocracy, was growing to be the chief power in the state. This became still more the case when, in 753 B.C., the life-magistracy was abolished, and the Archon was elevated to

democratic schemes of Cleisthenes. He determined to put an end, for good and all, to the local and family factions which had so long disturbed Athens. The old tribal divisions, with their subdivisions the trittyes and naucraries, were swept away. A new set of tribes, ten in number so as to be incapable of being made to correspond with any existing subdivisions of the earlier four, was called into existence, with new names and new associations. To each of these tribes were assigned three divisions bearing the old name of trittyes, of which one was taken from each of the three local divisions of the Plain, the Shore, and the Mountain, and these trittyes were again subdivided into demes, which henceforth became the local unit of Athenian politics. In a short time all the ordinary associations of civil life were connected with the deme to which a man belonged, and by the name of which, together with the name of his father, he was officially known; and the old local factions disappeared finally from Athenian history.

This was the main feature of the constitution of Cleisthenes, but there were various other alterations introduced by him, mostly of a less striking character in themselves, but all tending in the same direction, namely the extension of the powers of the commons. The most remarkable of these was the law of ostracism, which gave the populace the power by a free vote to decide between two rival leaders of the state, and thereby to commit itself unreservedly to the policy of one or the other. This was especially introduced as a precaution against the partisans of the expelled tyrants; but in the first instance the mere threat was found to be sufficient, and it was not put in force until the first Persian invasion showed that danger was still to be apprehended from that quarter. Another measure which must be ascribed to Cleisthenes, though it is the absolute contrary of that which has generally been believed to be a great feature of his constitution, is the

ditions they sought for a political remedy to their economical distress by calling for a share in the government of the country. At the same time they complained that there was no certainty nor uniformity about the administration of justice. The Thesmothetae had indeed been appointed partly with the intention of securing written and recorded decisions of cases; but there was no general code to guide them, and it would be long before a system of purely judge-made law could attain the desired precision and certainty of codified law. The agitation on both these grounds grew hot and led to violent civil dissension, and matters were not improved by the factions which prevailed among the governing aristocracy, of which the most powerful family was that of the Alcmeonidae.

The first outcome of the perturbed state of the country was an attempt to establish a tyranny. Cylon, an Olympic victor of the year 640 B.C., about eight years later seized the Acropolis with a band of friends and followers, and called on the populace to rise in his support. The attempt was unfortunate. The government had a sufficient force in hand to check a rising, if the people had been disposed to attempt it; the Acropolis was blockaded, and the well-known results followed. Cylon escaped, but his followers were forced to surrender and were treacherously put to death by the archon Megacles the Alcmeonid. These events did not tend to allay the discord in the state. The enemies of the Alcmeonidae had an effective handle given to them by the commission of this sacrilege, and attacked them more bitterly than before. The poor still complained of their want of representation in the government, of the uncertainty of the administration of the law, and of the generally hopeless condition of their prospects in life. This agitation at last had its effect, and about the year 621 B.C. the aristocracy consented to the appointment of Draco to deal with the trouble as seemed to him best.

show that the elaborate organisation of the judicial body which prevailed at a later time is to be attributed to Cleisthenes.

Of Cleisthenes himself we hear nothing after the year of his recall, in 508 B.C., and his predominance does not seem to have lasted long. The story of his suffering under his own law of ostracism is certainly false, and may be ascribed to a pleasing sense of poetical justice untrammelled by the details of facts; but the suggestion of Curtius, that he was forced to retire from public life through the indignation aroused by the proposal to buy Persian help against Sparta by submission to the Great King, is not improbable. However that may be, his work was done, and the Athenian democracy had made its next great step in advance on the lines laid down by Solon. The power of the lower orders now began to be felt in the state. The Ecclesia began to exercise larger functions, and its consent to any policy suggested by the Areopagus could no longer be assumed. The old factions were swept away, and it became necessary for the statesman who aspired to guide the country to have the ear of the people. The difference in practical working between the constitution of Solon and the constitution of Cleisthenes may be seen by a contrast of the methods of party warfare employed by Megacles and Pisistratus on the one hand, and Themistocles and Aristides on the other.

The effect of the reforms of Cleisthenes was seen at once in a long period of peace and development, during which Athens made that striking progress which is so strongly commented on by Herodotus (V. 78). Then came the period of the Persian wars, from which the democracy of Athens, which had been threatened with utter overthrow and dissolution, emerged stronger than ever. The years between the two invasions showed some striking developments of great importance. Two years after Marathon the Athenians resorted for the first time to the machinery of

the reforms of Draco; ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς σώμασιν ἦσαν δεδεμένοι, καὶ ἡ χώρα δι' ὀλίγων ἦν. The natural results followed, ἀντέστη τοῖς γνωρίμοις ὁ δῆμος. The populace rose against the upper class, the upper class was divided against itself, the land was full of conflict, and abroad it could show no front to its enemies, who held Salamis before its very door. Various remedies were tried, but with little avail. The Alcmeonidae, with the curse of heaven supposed to be resting on their house, were expelled from the country, and even their dead cast out of their tombs. But still the trouble continued, and Nisaea and Salamis, which under a sudden enthusiasm inspired by the poet Solon had been captured from Megara, were lost again within a few years. The curse was still on the country; and Epimenides the Cretan was called in to make a solemn purification of the land. The popular excitement was thus allayed, but the economic causes of trouble were still untouched, and it is a sign of the pacific effect of the visit of Epimenides that a few years afterwards all parties came to an agreement to entrust the complete reform of the state to a single individual. Solon, who had won the respect of all as poet and devoted patriot, who was moreover of fair position and wealth, was selected and received a free hand to deal with the economic and political condition of affairs.

He began with the former, and he found matters too desperate to admit of any but one remedy. All debts, public and private, were cancelled, and for the future the securing of debts upon the person of the debtor was forbidden. Independently of this, and subsequently to it, he effected a reform of the standards in use for weights, measures, and money, and introduced the Euboic standard of currency in place of the old Pheidonian or Aeginetan standard, thus simplifying Athenian trade with the mercantile cities of Euboea, and giving rise to that increase

of the war was a revival of the power of the Areopagus. The reforms of Cleisthenes and the consequent development of the democracy had seriously impaired its authority, but a period of war gave it an opportunity such as came to the Roman senate during the struggle with Carthage. At the critical moment before Salamis, when there was much doubt whether sufficient crews would be forthcoming to man the fleet, the strategi, who now were the chiefs of the military and naval forces of the country, seemed to be inclined to throw up the game in despair and bid every one save himself as best he could. At this moment the aristocratic council intervened and by a timely donation of money secured crews to man the fleet and saved Athens and Greece from disaster. This achievement raised the prestige of the Areopagus, and for several years it was once again the centre of the administration. Under its superintendence, as Aristotle testifies, all went well. The power of Athens expanded on every side. Under the leadership of Aristides the Confederacy of Delos was established in 478 B.C., and by the combined action of the two rivals, Aristides and Themistocles, the walls of Athens were rebuilt. Each of these statesmen served his country in his own way; but while the great achievements of Themistocles were connected with war and the preparations for war, Aristides is more important from the constitutional point of view. Though it is not the case, as has been supposed, that he threw open the archonship to all classes of the community, it was he that initiated another step which was of far greater importance for the development of the democracy. Aristotle attributes to him the counsel that the people should gather in the capital, instead of living scattered over the whole face of Attica, whereby they would be able to use their numerical strength to control the course of public affairs; while they could count on making their living by the payments given for

The Council of Draco was re-established, with the odd member struck off, making the total four hundred. By these measures, and by the general improvement in the position of the lower orders, the powers of the Areopagus were curtailed, but it still remained, as Aristotle expressly says, the guardian of the laws and of the state, with a general supervision of both public and private life, and a power of inflicting summary punishment.

The constitution of Solon, though in many points he was only following his predecessor Draco, was rightly regarded in later times as the origin of the democracy of Athens. The labouring class was for the first time given a voice in the government, and was taught to look upon itself as having the right to review, and if necessary to censure, the conduct of affairs by the magistrates whom it had itself elected. The popular assembly became for the first time the representative of the collective voice of the whole people, though a long course of political training was necessary before the classes newly admitted to the franchise were capable of exercising to any important extent the powers thus committed to them. The constitution of Solon was a great and memorable achievement, not so much for what it immediately accomplished as for its indication of the lines along which the Athenian democracy was to develop.

At the moment, indeed, it gave little satisfaction to anyone. The poorer classes had had their hopes and their cupidity excited by the long agitation which preceded the reforms; and though in fact they were gainers every way by the new legislation, for the moment they were disappointed because there had not been a general redistribution of the soil of the country, which would have given them a slice of their neighbours' property without labour and without cost. The aristocracy had more reason to be discontented with an arrangement which

numbers of the Areopagus itself, in no less a person than Themistocles. This somewhat tortuous politician was at the time under apprehension of a charge of Medism, which was being investigated by the Areopagus; and his share in the attack which was now being made on that body consisted principally in hastening the course of events. Having first warned Ephialtes that the Areopagus was about to arrest him, he proceeded to the Areopagus and there denounced Ephialtes as being engaged in a conspiracy against the state, and offered to conduct a party to the house where the conspirators were assembled. On arriving at the house of Ephialtes he managed that he should be seen talking with the members of the council who accompanied him. Ephialtes, thinking no doubt that the warning of Themistocles was being fulfilled, escaped and took refuge at the altar; but realising that his only chance of safety lay in taking the bull by the horns, he hurried to the Council of Five Hundred and made a violent attack on the Areopagus, presumably proposing to strip it at once of its peculiar powers. In this he was seconded by the versatile Themistocles, who no doubt was able to furnish some plausible explanation of his conduct. The matter was carried from the Council to the Ecclesia, and the attack was there completely successful. The Areopagus was deprived of all the rights which made it the general guardian of the state, and its functions were distributed between the Five Hundred, the Ecclesia, and the law-courts. Neither of the leaders, however, derived much advantage from their success. In the heat of party strife to which the conflict had given rise Ephialtes was assassinated, within the same year as the overthrow of the Areopagus; and though Themistocles seems to have escaped from the accusation which was then impending, he was ostracised almost immediately afterwards, and whilst in banishment the revelations which followed on

broken men 'and every one that was distressed, and every one that was in debt, and every one that was discontented' in every class of society.

But a fresh turn was given to affairs in 581 B.C., when an attempt was made to overthrow the constitution and establish a tyranny in its place. Damasias, who had been archon in the previous year, contrived to be continued in office during this year also. We are not told on what pretext this was effected, and the fact does not appear to have aroused alarm. But when the time came for new archons to enter into office in 580 B.C., and Damasias still showed no signs of abandoning his position, it was clear that his intention was to establish himself as a despot. Against this danger all parties of the state united, and as the would-be tyrant had neglected to provide himself with the only trustworthy support of a despotism, a paid military force, he was expelled from his position within two months after the completion of his second year of office. It then became necessary to provide for the government of the country during the remainder of the year, and as all parties had combined in the expulsion of the tyrant, all had a right to have their claims to consideration respected in the matter. The old aristocracy could not reasonably exclude the representatives of the other classes from a share in the government, but on the other hand they thought it a good opportunity to abolish the Solonian property-qualification which refused to recognise the claims of birth. Accordingly they reverted to the older division of classes, and drew up a board of ten, of which half was reserved to the Eupatridae, while three representatives were assigned to the Geomori and two to the Demiurgi. But this arrangement does not seem to have given satisfaction, for we hear nothing of its being continued beyond the year for which it was created, and we must presume that the Solonian system then returned into force.

that body. In the purely constitutional history of Athens, however, Pericles is not a figure of any great importance. No new departure was made by him. He merely carried out the principle of the sovereignty of the popular assembly which had been established by Ephialtes, and though he carried it out in such a way as to disguise the real dangers and weaknesses of that principle, he was yet in truth only the first of the demagogues to whom Athens ultimately owed her ruin. So long as the Ecclesia was directed by a man of high character and far-sighted statesmanship, such as Pericles, no harm could result; but when he was removed from the scene, the leadership fell into the hands of men of no principle and little statesmanship, and the assembly, growing arrogant by the very weakness of its leaders, became less and less manageable and less and less capable of directing the affairs of an empire through the various crises of a great war. The populace subsisted now on the public purse. Pericles had instituted payment for service in the law-courts, and when the Peloponnesian invasions drove all the inhabitants of Attica within the walls of the capital, and everyone was receiving pay either as juror or as soldier or as magistrate, the control of the state fell into the hands of the least capable but numerically largest section of the democracy, and of those who were best able to tickle its fancies or gratify its greed. The Athens of the early days of the Confederacy of Delos, in which the aristocratic and democratic elements were not unequally blended in the constitution, was capable of empire; but the Athens of the unmitigated democracy was not.

So Athens went steadily downhill, and of the later politicians those whom Aristotle finds it most in his heart to commend are Thucydides and Nicias and even the opportunist Theramenes. The mention of the latter leads on naturally to the description of the constitutional crisis

proved greater than his. Pisistratus was driven into exile, and for four years he had no chance of a return. Then the cards of party were shuffled anew, Megacles the leader of the Alcmeonidae and Pisistratus made friends, and the latter was re-established in the tyranny as the husband of his ally's daughter. Still, however, he had not learnt the only way in which a despotism could be made secure, and when a quarrel with his father-in-law threw the latter once more into alliance with Lycurgus and the party of the Plain, he had no choice but to escape while there was time, lest a worse thing happen to him. His second period of government had lasted about six years, but he had nearly twice that length of time to pass in exile. This time he learned his lesson thoroughly. He settled for some years in the rich metalliferous districts about the Strymon and Mount Pangaeus, and with the money which he derived thence he hired mercenaries and allies, and when about 535 B.C. he came back to Athens, he came to stay. His last period of government was not indeed very much longer than his other two, lasting apparently for about eight years, but it was of a very different kind. Before he had never been certain of his seat and was dependent on the precarious support of political rivals. This time he was firm in the saddle, and when he died at a good old age in 527 B.C. he left the quiet possession of the kingdom to his sons.

Of the government of the tyrants at Athens there is not much that is new to be said. It is agreed on all hands that the administration of Pisistratus was mild and beneficent, so that, as Aristotle expressly mentions, men recalled it afterwards as the Golden Age. The principle of the policy of Pisistratus was to keep the people employed and to keep them contented. To these ends law was administered equally and fairly, capital was provided to encourage agriculture and commerce, public works were

re-assumed the government very shortly afterwards, which may be taken to confirm the suggestion that this occurred after the battle of Cyzicus in 410 B.C., when the fleet, with its strong democratic tendencies, returned to Athens. Four years later came the victory of Arginusae, which gave Athens her last chance of an honourable escape from the war. But that victory was followed by a blunder and a crime which neutralised its results. The crime was the condemnation of the generals, of which Aristotle gives only a brief and apparently inaccurate account. The blunder was the refusal of the peace proposed by the Lacedaemonians, fatuously voted by the criminally light-hearted Ecclesia in obedience to the drunken braggadocio of Cleophon. The opportunity passed, never to return, and the next year saw Athens at the feet of her conqueror. The summer of 405 B.C. brought the fatal battle, or rather surprise, of Aegospotami, and in the following April Athens surrendered.

The fall of Athens brought upon her the last of her many alterations of constitution. The terms of peace included the provision that 'the ancient constitution' (ἡ πάτριος πολιτεία) should be restored. The expression left room for a considerable variety of interpretation, and the democrats, the moderate aristocrats (the leader of whom was Theramenes), and the extreme oligarchs all claimed to interpret it in a way suitable to their own views. But Lysander constituted himself a court of appeal to which there was no superior, and he cast his vote with the extreme oligarchs. The Thirty Tyrants, as they were subsequently entitled, were established in power by a forced vote of the people, and entered upon office about the beginning of May, 404 B.C. At first no complaint could be made of their rule, beyond their neglect to draw up the scheme of the constitution which was the special duty committed to them. Few regretted the

strong measures which they took against those pests of the law-courts, the professional accusers, and the other discreditable parasites of the democracy. But 'l'appétit vient en mangeant,' and the Thirty were less in favour when they passed on to lay hands on persons whose only offence was wealth. The butcher's bill mounted up fast, and in a few months the total of persons put to death by the oligarchy reached fifteen hundred. Meanwhile trouble was impending both within and without the city. Abroad, the numbers of the exiles in the neighbouring states of Thebes and Argos were increasing and the government was rapidly losing the sympathy of the inhabitants of those countries. At home, the moderate party among the Thirty was protesting more and more vehemently against the violence of the extremists. Theramenes, their leader, constantly urged the more extreme party to place the government on a broader basis, in order to secure more popular support. To pacify him, his colleagues agreed to draw up a roll of three thousand names, who should have some share in the government; but they delayed to publish the list and had clearly no intention of making it a reality.

At this point their action began to be hastened from outside. Late in the autumn Thrasybulus, with his little band of seventy fellow-exiles, surprised and occupied the frontier post of Phyle. The Thirty made one or two attempts to expel the intruders, but the severe weather and a clever surprise effected by Thrasybulus caused their forces to retire defeated. They began now to take alarm and perceived that it was necessary to set their house somewhat in order, that they might not be divided against themselves at home. The first step was to dispose of Theramenes, a person who must at all times have been singularly embarrassing to his less versatile colleagues. This was done, according to Aristotle, in a somewhat

neater fashion than the rough-and-ready method described by Xenophon. A law was proposed which gave the Thirty summary power of life and death against all who were not on the list of the Three Thousand as finally revised and published. This was probably passed without much opposition even from the more moderate members of the Thirty; but it was followed by another which enacted that all persons should be excluded from a share in the government (*i.e.* from the Three Thousand) who had had any hand in overthrowing the Four Hundred. By this law Theramenes was clearly put outside the pale and was thereupon arrested and put to death. Immediately after this the whole population outside the Three Thousand was deprived of arms, a Spartan force was (now for the first time, according to Aristotle) invited to the Acropolis, and the Thirty may have felt that they could now look their enemy in the face.

If so, they were promptly undeceived. Thrasybulus had been waiting at Phyle till his numbers had increased to upwards of a thousand; but about January, a time when military movements were not to be expected, he suddenly set out for Athens and established himself in Munychia before the Thirty could gather a force to oppose him. The combat that followed killed the chiefs of the Thirty and wrecked their government. The very next day their followers met in the agora and deposed their defeated and discredited leaders, and appointed a new board of Ten with instructions to bring the war to a close. The Ten, however, had ideas of the pleasures of government which led them to neglect their commission, and their first steps were to send representatives to Sparta to secure countenance and a loan of money. When complaints began to be heard against them in the city, some timely severity, backed by Callibius and his Spartans, showed that they did not mean to be trifled with. It was not until the bulk

of the population had slipped away to Piraeus, and it became clear that the party of the city had grown weaker than that of the suburb, that the obstruction of the Ten was overcome. A second board of Ten was appointed, consisting of moderate and constitutional men, and these, acting in unison with the Spartan king Pausanias, brought the negotiations to a successful issue. An amnesty was granted, with exceptions only against the Thirty, the first board of Ten, and their immediate instruments, and, while every inducement was held out to persuade all other persons to remain in Athens, a sanctuary was granted at Eleusis to those who were afraid to stay. The tact, moderation, and justice of Archinus, one of the leaders of the exiles who returned with Thrasybulus, smoothed over the dangers and difficulties which naturally attended the first few months of settling down after the civil war; and when, two years afterwards, the last traces of the evil times had been obliterated by the re-absorption of the secessionists at Eleusis into the body of the community, the last of the revolutions of Athens was over and her constitutional history closed.

So at least it seemed to Aristotle, and few will care to dispute his judgment. It is true that the restored democracy lasted for three-quarters of a century yet, and that a history of that period is much to be desired from some less prejudiced authority than that of the orators. But it presents no points of constitutional interest, and Aristotle could have done little but echo the lamentations of Demosthenes over the shallow fickleness and the vanished energy of the Athenian democracy. Nor could we wish for an account of the petty details of changes which followed on the descent of Greece to the position of a subject power, or to know that a tribe was added here and a ship's name altered there in compliment to one or other of the successors of Alexander. The lessons of Athenian con-

stitutional history, such as they are, end with the close of the fifth century. Aristotle sums them up in a list of eleven epochs[1], and when we consider that ten of the changes enumerated fall within a period of barely more than two hundred years, it can but intensify the feeling which inevitably arises from the study of the history of Athens, that, while no nation ever possessed such brilliant philosophical writers with such an aptitude for political theory, none was ever so incompetent to convert those theories into stable political practice.

The second part of Aristotle's work requires little description. It is shorter than the first, in its present condition considerably shorter, since the conclusion of it is seriously mutilated; and its contents are less new and of less general interest. It has been largely quarried by the grammarians and lexicographers of later ages, from whom modern students of Athenian antiquities have derived their information; and in these passages its chief value is that it substitutes a primary and contemporary witness for the secondary authorities upon whom we have hitherto depended, while, for the most part, it shows that these compilers have done their work accurately. It adds, however, a considerable number of hitherto unknown facts, and it must unquestionably take rank for the future as a leading authority for the student of the details of Athenian administration. It is a summary of the machinery of government as it existed in the days of Aristotle. It opens with

[1] He takes the original establishment of Ion and his successors as his starting-point, and enumerates the following epochs of change: (1) Theseus, a slight modification of absolute monarchy; (2) Draco, the first legislator; (3) Solon, the foundation of the democracy; (4) Pisistratus, the period of tyranny; (5) Cleisthenes, the re-establishment of democracy in a more pronounced form; (6) the Persian wars, the revival of the Areopagus; (7) Aristides and Ephialtes, the encouragement of the lower orders and overthrow of the Areopagus, followed by the disastrous period of the demagogues; (8) the Four Hundred; (9) the restored democracy; (10) the Thirty and the Ten; (11) the finally restored democracy.

of the war was a revival of the power of the Areopagus. The reforms of Cleisthenes and the consequent development of the democracy had seriously impaired its authority, but a period of war gave it an opportunity such as came to the Roman senate during the struggle with Carthage. At the critical moment before Salamis, when there was much doubt whether sufficient crews would be forthcoming to man the fleet, the strategi, who now were the chiefs of the military and naval forces of the country, seemed to be inclined to throw up the game in despair and bid every one save himself as best he could. At this moment the aristocratic council intervened and by a timely donation of money secured crews to man the fleet and saved Athens and Greece from disaster. This achievement raised the prestige of the Areopagus, and for several years it was once again the centre of the administration. Under its superintendence, as Aristotle testifies, all went well. The power of Athens expanded on every side. Under the leadership of Aristides the Confederacy of Delos was established in 478 B.C., and by the combined action of the two rivals, Aristides and Themistocles, the walls of Athens were rebuilt. Each of these statesmen served his country in his own way; but while the great achievements of Themistocles were connected with war and the preparations for war, Aristides is more important from the constitutional point of view. Though it is not the case, as has been supposed, that he threw open the archonship to all classes of the community, it was he that initiated another step which was of far greater importance for the development of the democracy. Aristotle attributes to him the counsel that the people should gather in the capital, instead of living scattered over the whole face of Attica, whereby they would be able to use their numerical strength to control the course of public affairs; while they could count on making their living by the payments given for

may be derived from the constitutional history of Athens as represented in this treatise. The point of importance is that we may now fairly believe ourselves to be in the possession of the testimony of Aristotle as to the course and details of that history.

The importance of this testimony will hardly be disputed, whether his work be regarded as a contribution to the lessons of political philosophy, or as an assistance to the reconstruction of the history of a country in which we are so deeply interested as Athens. It is true that we have already Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, and Plutarch as authorities for the same period. But of these Thucydides alone is beyond suspicion, and it is precisely the years covered by his history that are of least importance to the work of Aristotle. Herodotus is brief and often unsatisfactory on the early history of Athens, and has little interest in purely political and constitutional details. Xenophon's accuracy is open to doubt, and his narrative is so incomplete as to admit of considerable supplementing, not to say correction. Plutarch's sources were of too various a quality to allow of his extremely valuable narratives being taken without reservation; and one of the great advantages of the re-appearance of Aristotle's work is that it enables us to test in many points the accuracy of Plutarch's compilations. On the merits of Aristotle as an authority it is not necessary to dwell. His impartiality, his dispassionateness, his matter-of-fact statement of his materials, are as evident here as in any of his other works. He records facts creditable to the democracy and facts which tell against it with an equal air of desiring nothing but the truth. And indeed he occupied a position in which impartiality was not very difficult. The game of Athenian independence was over. Aristotle's own interests were in no way bound up with the credit or with the success of any political party. He was able to stand aloof

numbers of the Areopagus itself, in no less a person than Themistocles. This somewhat tortuous politician was at the time under apprehension of a charge of Medism, which was being investigated by the Areopagus; and his share in the attack which was now being made on that body consisted principally in hastening the course of events. Having first warned Ephialtes that the Areopagus was about to arrest him, he proceeded to the Areopagus and there denounced Ephialtes as being engaged in a conspiracy against the state, and offered to conduct a party to the house where the conspirators were assembled. On arriving at the house of Ephialtes he managed that he should be seen talking with the members of the council who accompanied him. Ephialtes, thinking no doubt that the warning of Themistocles was being fulfilled, escaped and took refuge at the altar; but realising that his only chance of safety lay in taking the bull by the horns, he hurried to the Council of Five Hundred and made a violent attack on the Areopagus, presumably proposing to strip it at once of its peculiar powers. In this he was seconded by the versatile Themistocles, who no doubt was able to furnish some plausible explanation of his conduct. The matter was carried from the Council to the Ecclesia, and the attack was there completely successful. The Areopagus was deprived of all the rights which made it the general guardian of the state, and its functions were distributed between the Five Hundred, the Ecclesia, and the law-courts. Neither of the leaders, however, derived much advantage from their success. In the heat of party strife to which the conflict had given rise Ephialtes was assassinated, within the same year as the overthrow of the Areopagus; and though Themistocles seems to have escaped from the accusation which was then impending, he was ostracised almost immediately afterwards, and whilst in banishment the revelations which followed on

however, which still require emendation by conjecture, in some of which the reading of the MS. is completely lost, while in others a few faint traces of letters remain which will serve as tests of the accuracy of any proposed restoration. For the rest, the notes represent a first attempt to estimate the bearing of the new material on the received versions of Athenian history.

The text has been divided into chapters for convenience of reference, but the beginnings of the original columns of the MS. are indicated in the margin. Square brackets have been used to mark words or letters which have been supplied where the MS. is illegible, and words which appear to have been accidentally omitted in the MS. are supplied between angular brackets. The few cases in which the reading of the MS. has not been followed in the text are recorded in the notes, while passages in which the MS. reading appears to be corrupt, but which have not been altered in the text, are marked by *obeli*.

F. G. K.

INTRODUCTION
TO THE THIRD EDITION.

A FEW words of introduction may serve to explain the object of the present edition of the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία. The first and second editions (the latter being an immediate reprint of the former to supply the first demand, with only a few corrections) having been exhausted, it has been represented that a revision of the *editio princeps* might be of some service to English students, especially as, up to the present time, no independent study of the original MS. has been undertaken, which might state the bearing of the testimony of the MS. on the various emendations which have been proposed since the first appearance of the work. Those who have most used the MS. or the facsimile of it know best that in very many passages words must be conjectured before they can be read, and that faint indications of letters may often be interpreted in different ways. Hence no one can be less surprised than the editor that the ingenuity of other scholars and continued work on the papyrus have led to the decipherment of some passages which were left blank in the first edition, and to the correct reading of others which had been mis-read. The first purpose of the present edition is, consequently, to offer a revised version of the text, in which full attention has been paid to the conjectures of others and to the readings which have been extracted, or thought to be

extracted, from the facsimile; and the opportunity has also been taken to revise, to some extent, the historical notes by which the text is accompanied.

For the execution of this revision the materials, in addition to the repeated study of the papyrus itself, are many and various. In the first place must be mentioned the two recensions of the text, based upon collations of the facsimile, which appeared almost simultaneously during the past summer, the first by G. Kaibel and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, the second by H. van Herwerden and J. van Leeuwen. The names of these scholars are sufficient to guarantee the value of their contributions to the textual criticism of the work; but, in addition to this, both pairs of editors have devoted much time and labour to the collation of the autotype facsimile of the MS. The difficulty of such a task can only be understood by those who have attempted the same undertaking. The original MS. is not always easy to read; but the difficulty of decipherment is greatly increased when the decipherer is forced to use a photograph, which, however well and carefully prepared, is inevitably (in the case of a stained and dark-coloured papyrus) less clear than the original. Shadows and fibres of papyrus assume the appearance of ink-strokes, and only a reference to the MS. itself can save the most brilliant decipherer from errors arising from this cause. In spite of these obstacles, it must gladly be recognised that both the German and the Dutch editors have accomplished their task admirably, and have in many cases arrived at the correct readings of passages which had hitherto baffled decipherment. Unfortunately the Dutch editors took no steps to have their readings of the obscurer passages collated with the MS., and they have consequently at times fallen into very natural errors of the kind just alluded to; and it is further to be regretted that they had not seen a list of tolerably certain corrections from the

re-assumed the government very shortly afterwards, which may be taken to confirm the suggestion that this occurred after the battle of Cyzicus in 410 B.C., when the fleet, with its strong democratic tendencies, returned to Athens. Four years later came the victory of Arginusae, which gave Athens her last chance of an honourable escape from the war. But that victory was followed by a blunder and a crime which neutralised its results. The crime was the condemnation of the generals, of which Aristotle gives only a brief and apparently inaccurate account. The blunder was the refusal of the peace proposed by the Lacedaemonians, fatuously voted by the criminally light-hearted Ecclesia in obedience to the drunken braggadocio of Cleophon. The opportunity passed, never to return, and the next year saw Athens at the feet of her conqueror. The summer of 405 B.C. brought the fatal battle, or rather surprise, of Aegospotami, and in the following April Athens surrendered.

The fall of Athens brought upon her the last of her many alterations of constitution. The terms of peace included the provision that 'the ancient constitution' (ἡ πάτριος πολιτεία) should be restored. The expression left room for a considerable variety of interpretation, and the democrats, the moderate aristocrats (the leader of whom was Theramenes), and the extreme oligarchs all claimed to interpret it in a way suitable to their own views. But Lysander constituted himself a court of appeal to which there was no superior, and he cast his vote with the extreme oligarchs. The Thirty Tyrants, as they were subsequently entitled, were established in power by a forced vote of the people, and entered upon office about the beginning of May, 404 B.C. At first no complaint could be made of their rule, beyond their neglect to draw up the scheme of the constitution which was the special duty committed to them. Few regretted the

upon conjectural grounds; hence, though useful, it is not so important as the two works just mentioned. The translations of Kaibel and Kiessling, Poland, Reinach, and Zuretti have also been frequently consulted. Treatises on the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία have been written in all languages and of all kinds, and many of these have been made available (chiefly by the kindness of their authors) for the preparation of the present volume. A list of these is given at the end of this Introduction; among the most useful may be mentioned those of Messrs. Newman, Macan, Weil, Keil, Gomperz, and Meyer, and the detailed examination of the chronology of the treatise by Adolf Bauer; while the treatises of Cauer and Rühl are interesting as representing the case of those who take the most adverse view of the value and authenticity of the work. References to some of the opinions expressed by these writers will be found in the notes.

There remain the emendations of single passages which have been made by various scholars at home and abroad. Emendations have indeed been made ὅλῳ τῷ θυλάκῳ, and if a larger proportion of them has not been adopted in the present edition, it is not so much from a want of recognition of the ability of their proposers, as from a doubt as to the extent to which conjectural emendation is admissible. The recent discoveries of very early MSS. of classical authors do not produce a very exalted idea of the success of modern ingenuity in restoring ancient texts, except in the most obvious details; and though a MS. may be wrong, the chances seem to be largely against a conjecture going right[1]. The evidence afforded by the Petrie

[1] Two somewhat remarkable instances of the danger of conjectural emendation, even where apparently most justifiable, are provided by the present MS. In ch. 12, l. 22, the MS. reads δήιον, which was altered in the 1st ed. to δήιοι, in accordance with Plut. *Sol.* 16, where the passage is quoted. But the MSS. of Plutarch have δήιον, and δήιοι was only a conjecture of Reiske's, adopted by Bergk. Again, in ch. 43, l. 29, the MS. reads ἐπιχειροτονίαν, but the editions

neater fashion than the rough-and-ready method described by Xenophon. A law was proposed which gave the Thirty summary power of life and death against all who were not on the list of the Three Thousand as finally revised and published. This was probably passed without much opposition even from the more moderate members of the Thirty; but it was followed by another which enacted that all persons should be excluded from a share in the government (*i. e.* from the Three Thousand) who had had any hand in overthrowing the Four Hundred. By this law Theramenes was clearly put outside the pale and was thereupon arrested and put to death. Immediately after this the whole population outside the Three Thousand was deprived of arms, a Spartan force was (now for the first time, according to Aristotle) invited to the Acropolis, and the Thirty may have felt that they could now look their enemy in the face.

If so, they were promptly undeceived. Thrasybulus had been waiting at Phyle till his numbers had increased to upwards of a thousand; but about January, a time when military movements were not to be expected, he suddenly set out for Athens and established himself in Munychia before the Thirty could gather a force to oppose him. The combat that followed killed the chiefs of the Thirty and wrecked their government. The very next day their followers met in the agora and deposed their defeated and discredited leaders, and appointed a new board of Ten with instructions to bring the war to a close. The Ten, however, had ideas of the pleasures of government which led them to neglect their commission, and their first steps were to send representatives to Sparta to secure countenance and a loan of money. When complaints began to be heard against them in the city, some timely severity, backed by Callibius and his Spartans, showed that they did not mean to be trifled with. It was not until the bulk

stitutional history, such as they are, end with the close of the fifth century. Aristotle sums them up in a list of eleven epochs[1], and when we consider that ten of the changes enumerated fall within a period of barely more than two hundred years, it can but intensify the feeling which inevitably arises from the study of the history of Athens, that, while no nation ever possessed such brilliant philosophical writers with such an aptitude for political theory, none was ever so incompetent to convert those theories into stable political practice.

The second part of Aristotle's work requires little description. It is shorter than the first, in its present condition considerably shorter, since the conclusion of it is seriously mutilated; and its contents are less new and of less general interest. It has been largely quarried by the grammarians and lexicographers of later ages, from whom modern students of Athenian antiquities have derived their information; and in these passages its chief value is that it substitutes a primary and contemporary witness for the secondary authorities upon whom we have hitherto depended, while, for the most part, it shows that these compilers have done their work accurately. It adds, however, a considerable number of hitherto unknown facts, and it must unquestionably take rank for the future as a leading authority for the student of the details of Athenian administration. It is a summary of the machinery of government as it existed in the days of Aristotle. It opens with

[1] He takes the original establishment of Ion and his successors as his starting-point, and enumerates the following epochs of change: (1) Theseus, a slight modification of absolute monarchy; (2) Draco, the first legislator; (3) Solon, the foundation of the democracy; (4) Pisistratus, the period of tyranny; (5) Cleisthenes, the re-establishment of democracy in a more pronounced form; (6) the Persian wars, the revival of the Areopagus; (7) Aristides and Ephialtes, the encouragement of the lower orders and overthrow of the Areopagus, followed by the disastrous period of the demagogues; (8) the Four Hundred; (9) the restored democracy; (10) the Thirty and the Ten; (11) the finally restored democracy.

a description of the form of admission of the youthful Athenian to his place in the constitution when he came of age (ch. 42). It then describes the various ἀρχαί which the constitution included, the Ecclesia, the Council, the magistrates, whether elected by lot or by direct vote, and the courts of law. The Ecclesia is only mentioned as it were incidentally, in connection with the functions of the Prytanes (cc. 43, 44); but the Council is shown to be the pivot of Athenian domestic administration. Its constitution is described in cc. 43, 44; the functions which it administered independently in cc. 45, 46, 49; and its co-operation with a multitude of different magistrates in cc. 47–49. These magistrates were all elected by lot; and a description follows of other magistrates similarly elected (cc. 50–60), the archons being dealt with at especial length (cc. 55–59). The military officers elected by direct choice are enumerated in ch. 61 (there is an allusion to some other magistrates similarly elected in ch. 43). A slight account is then given of the method of election of those magistrates who were chosen by lot, and of the pay which various magistrates received (ch. 62). Finally, the machinery of the law-courts is described at considerable length (ch. 63 and fragments), but unfortunately the greater part of this section is hopelessly mutilated.

Here Aristotle's treatise closes. He does not attempt to apply to the history of Athens the principles which he lays down in the *Politics*, nor indeed to extract any lessons from it at all. He was here concerned solely in summarising the facts of that history, leaving the generalisations and deductions to the philosophical work. Facts stated in the *Politeia* are often alluded to in the *Politics*, not unfrequently, as the notes in the present volume try to indicate, in similar words and from the same point of view; but there is no direct reference from the one to the other. One may therefore refrain here from discussing the political lessons which

may be derived from the constitutional history of Athens as represented in this treatise. The point of importance is that we may now fairly believe ourselves to be in the possession of the testimony of Aristotle as to the course and details of that history.

The importance of this testimony will hardly be disputed, whether his work be regarded as a contribution to the lessons of political philosophy, or as an assistance to the reconstruction of the history of a country in which we are so deeply interested as Athens. It is true that we have already Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, and Plutarch as authorities for the same period. But of these Thucydides alone is beyond suspicion, and it is precisely the years covered by his history that are of least importance to the work of Aristotle. Herodotus is brief and often unsatisfactory on the early history of Athens, and has little interest in purely political and constitutional details. Xenophon's accuracy is open to doubt, and his narrative is so incomplete as to admit of considerable supplementing, not to say correction. Plutarch's sources were of too various a quality to allow of his extremely valuable narratives being taken without reservation; and one of the great advantages of the re-appearance of Aristotle's work is that it enables us to test in many points the accuracy of Plutarch's compilations. On the merits of Aristotle as an authority it is not necessary to dwell. His impartiality, his dispassionateness, his matter-of-fact statement of his materials, are as evident here as in any of his other works. He records facts creditable to the democracy and facts which tell against it with an equal air of desiring nothing but the truth. And indeed he occupied a position in which impartiality was not very difficult. The game of Athenian independence was over. Aristotle's own interests were in no way bound up with the credit or with the success of any political party. He was able to stand aloof

and calmly collect the facts of the past history of Athens just as impartially as when he was dealing with the Carthaginians or the Brahmins, with the rules of the syllogism or the structures of the animal creation.

Of the authorities used in his task he tells us little, almost nothing. It is certain that he was acquainted with both Herodotus and Thucydides. Herodotus he quotes by name (ch. 14); and in another passage he mentions, for the purpose of correction, a narrative which is identical with that of Thucydides (ch. 18). For the period of Solon he evidently used Solon's own writings, from which he makes considerable quotations. But for the rest there seems to be nothing to show what his sources were. Only, from the detailed way in which he describes the constitutions of Draco or of Cleisthenes, from the precise dates which are so frequently given in his narrative (which enable us to fix several events with an exactness hitherto impossible), it is clear that he did not rest upon tradition alone, but was making use of written records of some kind or another. Fortunately it is not of so much importance to identify his actual sources as in the case of such an author as Plutarch. Aristotle took care to sift his evidence for himself, instead of leaving it to be done by posterity, and when he clearly and positively states a fact his statement is not lightly to be put aside.

This Introduction is only the first word upon a subject on which the last word cannot be spoken for a long time. The whole work opens up possibilities of discussion in every direction, and raises questions which can only be settled by a consensus of opinion after they have been examined and considered by scholars of all countries. In the present edition the matter of most importance is the text, and every effort has been made to reproduce it as accurately as possible. There remain not a few passages,

and calmly collect the facts of the past history of Athens just as impartially as when he was dealing with the Carthaginians or the Brahmins, with the rules of the syllogism or the structures of the animal creation.

Of the authorities used in his task he tells us little, almost nothing. It is certain that he was acquainted with both Herodotus and Thucydides. Herodotus he quotes by name (ch. 14); and in another passage he mentions, for the purpose of correction, a narrative which is identical with that of Thucydides (ch. 18). For the period of Solon he evidently used Solon's own writings, from which he makes considerable quotations. But for the rest there seems to be nothing to show what his sources were. Only, from the detailed way in which he describes the constitutions of Draco or of Cleisthenes, from the precise dates which are so frequently given in his narrative (which enable us to fix several events with an exactness hitherto impossible), it is clear that he did not rest upon tradition alone, but was making use of written records of some kind or another. Fortunately it is not of so much importance to identify his actual sources as in the case of such an author as Plutarch. Aristotle took care to sift his evidence for himself, instead of leaving it to be done by posterity, and when he clearly and positively states a fact his statement is not lightly to be put aside.

This Introduction is only the first word upon a subject on which the last word cannot be spoken for a long time. The whole work opens up possibilities of discussion in every direction, and raises questions which can only be settled by a consensus of opinion after they have been examined and considered by scholars of all countries. In the present edition the matter of most importance is the text, and every effort has been made to reproduce it as accurately as possible. There remain not a few passages,

INTRODUCTION
TO THE THIRD EDITION.

A FEW words of introduction may serve to explain the object of the present edition of the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία. The first and second editions (the latter being an immediate reprint of the former to supply the first demand, with only a few corrections) having been exhausted, it has been represented that a revision of the *editio princeps* might be of some service to English students, especially as, up to the present time, no independent study of the original MS. has been undertaken, which might state the bearing of the testimony of the MS. on the various emendations which have been proposed since the first appearance of the work. Those who have most used the MS. or the facsimile of it know best that in very many passages words must be conjectured before they can be read, and that faint indications of letters may often be interpreted in different ways. Hence no one can be less surprised than the editor that the ingenuity of other scholars and continued work on the papyrus have led to the decipherment of some passages which were left blank in the first edition, and to the correct reading of others which had been mis-read. The first purpose of the present edition is, consequently, to offer a revised version of the text, in which full attention has been paid to the conjectures of others and to the readings which have been extracted, or thought to be

however, which still require emendation by conjecture, in some of which the reading of the MS. is completely lost, while in others a few faint traces of letters remain which will serve as tests of the accuracy of any proposed restoration. For the rest, the notes represent a first attempt to estimate the bearing of the new material on the received versions of Athenian history.

The text has been divided into chapters for convenience of reference, but the beginnings of the original columns of the MS. are indicated in the margin. Square brackets have been used to mark words or letters which have been supplied where the MS. is illegible, and words which appear to have been accidentally omitted in the MS. are supplied between angular brackets. The few cases in which the reading of the MS. has not been followed in the text are recorded in the notes, while passages in which the MS. reading appears to be corrupt, but which have not been altered in the text, are marked by *obeli.*

F. G. K.

INTRODUCTION
TO THE THIRD EDITION.

A FEW words of introduction may serve to explain the object of the present edition of the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία. The first and second editions (the latter being an immediate reprint of the former to supply the first demand, with only a few corrections) having been exhausted, it has been represented that a revision of the *editio princeps* might be of some service to English students, especially as, up to the present time, no independent study of the original MS. has been undertaken, which might state the bearing of the testimony of the MS. on the various emendations which have been proposed since the first appearance of the work. Those who have most used the MS. or the facsimile of it know best that in very many passages words must be conjectured before they can be read, and that faint indications of letters may often be interpreted in different ways. Hence no one can be less surprised than the editor that the ingenuity of other scholars and continued work on the papyrus have led to the decipherment of some passages which were left blank in the first edition, and to the correct reading of others which had been mis-read. The first purpose of the present edition is, consequently, to offer a revised version of the text, in which full attention has been paid to the conjectures of others and to the readings which have been extracted, or thought to be

extracted, from the facsimile; and the opportunity has also been taken to revise, to some extent, the historical notes by which the text is accompanied.

For the execution of this revision the materials, in addition to the repeated study of the papyrus itself, are many and various. In the first place must be mentioned the two recensions of the text, based upon collations of the facsimile, which appeared almost simultaneously during the past summer, the first by G. Kaibel and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, the second by H. van Herwerden and J. van Leeuwen. The names of these scholars are sufficient to guarantee the value of their contributions to the textual criticism of the work; but, in addition to this, both pairs of editors have devoted much time and labour to the collation of the autotype facsimile of the MS. The difficulty of such a task can only be understood by those who have attempted the same undertaking. The original MS. is not always easy to read; but the difficulty of decipherment is greatly increased when the decipherer is forced to use a photograph, which, however well and carefully prepared, is inevitably (in the case of a stained and dark-coloured papyrus) less clear than the original. Shadows and fibres of papyrus assume the appearance of ink-strokes, and only a reference to the MS. itself can save the most brilliant decipherer from errors arising from this cause. In spite of these obstacles, it must gladly be recognised that both the German and the Dutch editors have accomplished their task admirably, and have in many cases arrived at the correct readings of passages which had hitherto baffled decipherment. Unfortunately the Dutch editors took no steps to have their readings of the obscurer passages collated with the MS., and they have consequently at times fallen into very natural errors of the kind just alluded to; and it is further to be regretted that they had not seen a list of tolerably certain corrections from the

MS. of the readings of the first edition, which appeared in the *Classical Review* for June 1891. This, however, affects only a comparatively small number of details, and does not greatly detract from the value of an edition which (although several of the emendations adopted in it appear unnecessary) has considerably advanced the textual criticism of the newly discovered classic, and has been of great assistance in the preparation of the present text. The collection in the notes of the principal conjectures which have been offered for the improvement of the text and the *observationes palaeographicae* appended to the volume have been of special use; while the detailed *index verborum* supplies a want which many scholars have felt. The German editors, though they do not give these additional aids, are more successful in their extraction of the MS. readings, and more conservative in their retention of them. Prof. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff has, moreover, devoted much pains to the correct reading and restoration of the mutilated and defaced fragments of the fourth roll of the papyrus; and the brilliant results achieved out of such unpromising materials, resulting in the restoration to Aristotle of several additional paragraphs, deserve the greatest admiration. It would be impertinent in the present editor to attempt to commend the work of scholars of such eminence as these, but it may briefly be stated that it is only the advantage of having the original MS. to work from which justifies the independent views expressed in this volume, and that it is to be wished that, in order to settle the most doubtful points, a separate study of the MS. may be undertaken by some independent scholar of recognised palaeographical experience.

An Italian recension of the text has also appeared, edited by C. Ferrini, with a translation attached. This, however, does not represent a fresh study of the MS. or facsimile, but is a revision of the text of the *editio princeps*

neater fashion than the rough-and-ready method described by Xenophon. A law was proposed which gave the Thirty summary power of life and death against all who were not on the list of the Three Thousand as finally revised and published. This was probably passed without much opposition even from the more moderate members of the Thirty; but it was followed by another which enacted that all persons should be excluded from a share in the government (*i. e.* from the Three Thousand) who had had any hand in overthrowing the Four Hundred. By this law Theramenes was clearly put outside the pale and was thereupon arrested and put to death. Immediately after this the whole population outside the Three Thousand was deprived of arms, a Spartan force was (now for the first time, according to Aristotle) invited to the Acropolis, and the Thirty may have felt that they could now look their enemy in the face.

If so, they were promptly undeceived. Thrasybulus had been waiting at Phyle till his numbers had increased to upwards of a thousand; but about January, a time when military movements were not to be expected, he suddenly set out for Athens and established himself in Munychia before the Thirty could gather a force to oppose him. The combat that followed killed the chiefs of the Thirty and wrecked their government. The very next day their followers met in the agora and deposed their defeated and discredited leaders, and appointed a new board of Ten with instructions to bring the war to a close. The Ten, however, had ideas of the pleasures of government which led them to neglect their commission, and their first steps were to send representatives to Sparta to secure countenance and a loan of money. When complaints began to be heard against them in the city, some timely severity, backed by Callibius and his Spartans, showed that they did not mean to be trifled with. It was not until the bulk

of the population had slipped away to Piraeus, and it became clear that the party of the city had grown weaker than that of the suburb, that the obstruction of the Ten was overcome. A second board of Ten was appointed, consisting of moderate and constitutional men, and these, acting in unison with the Spartan king Pausanias, brought the negotiations to a successful issue. An amnesty was granted, with exceptions only against the Thirty, the first board of Ten, and their immediate instruments, and, while every inducement was held out to persuade all other persons to remain in Athens, a sanctuary was granted at Eleusis to those who were afraid to stay. The tact, moderation, and justice of Archinus, one of the leaders of the exiles who returned with Thrasybulus, smoothed over the dangers and difficulties which naturally attended the first few months of settling down after the civil war; and when, two years afterwards, the last traces of the evil times had been obliterated by the re-absorption of the secessionists at Eleusis into the body of the community, the last of the revolutions of Athens was over and her constitutional history closed.

So at least it seemed to Aristotle, and few will care to dispute his judgment. It is true that the restored democracy lasted for three-quarters of a century yet, and that a history of that period is much to be desired from some less prejudiced authority than that of the orators. But it presents no points of constitutional interest, and Aristotle could have done little but echo the lamentations of Demosthenes over the shallow fickleness and the vanished energy of the Athenian democracy. Nor could we wish for an account of the petty details of changes which followed on the descent of Greece to the position of a subject power, or to know that a tribe was added here and a ship's name altered there in compliment to one or other of the successors of Alexander. The lessons of Athenian con-

stitutional history, such as they are, end with the close of the fifth century. Aristotle sums them up in a list of eleven epochs[1], and when we consider that ten of the changes enumerated fall within a period of barely more than two hundred years, it can but intensify the feeling which inevitably arises from the study of the history of Athens, that, while no nation ever possessed such brilliant philosophical writers with such an aptitude for political theory, none was ever so incompetent to convert those theories into stable political practice.

The second part of Aristotle's work requires little description. It is shorter than the first, in its present condition considerably shorter, since the conclusion of it is seriously mutilated; and its contents are less new and of less general interest. It has been largely quarried by the grammarians and lexicographers of later ages, from whom modern students of Athenian antiquities have derived their information; and in these passages its chief value is that it substitutes a primary and contemporary witness for the secondary authorities upon whom we have hitherto depended, while, for the most part, it shows that these compilers have done their work accurately. It adds, however, a considerable number of hitherto unknown facts, and it must unquestionably take rank for the future as a leading authority for the student of the details of Athenian administration. It is a summary of the machinery of government as it existed in the days of Aristotle. It opens with

[1] He takes the original establishment of Ion and his successors as his starting-point, and enumerates the following epochs of change: (1) Theseus, a slight modification of absolute monarchy; (2) Draco, the first legislator; (3) Solon, the foundation of the democracy; (4) Pisistratus, the period of tyranny; (5) Cleisthenes, the re-establishment of democracy in a more pronounced form; (6) the Persian wars, the revival of the Areopagus; (7) Aristides and Ephialtes, the encouragement of the lower orders and overthrow of the Areopagus, followed by the disastrous period of the demagogues; (8) the Four Hundred; (9) the restored democracy; (10) the Thirty and the Ten; (11) the finally restored democracy.

a description of the form of admission of the youthful Athenian to his place in the constitution when he came of age (ch. 42). It then describes the various ἀρχαί which the constitution included, the Ecclesia, the Council, the magistrates, whether elected by lot or by direct vote, and the courts of law. The Ecclesia is only mentioned as it were incidentally, in connection with the functions of the Prytanes (cc. 43, 44); but the Council is shown to be the pivot of Athenian domestic administration. Its constitution is described in cc. 43, 44; the functions which it administered independently in cc. 45, 46, 49; and its co-operation with a multitude of different magistrates in cc. 47–49. These magistrates were all elected by lot; and a description follows of other magistrates similarly elected (cc. 50–60), the archons being dealt with at especial length (cc. 55–59). The military officers elected by direct choice are enumerated in ch. 61 (there is an allusion to some other magistrates similarly elected in ch. 43). A slight account is then given of the method of election of those magistrates who were chosen by lot, and of the pay which various magistrates received (ch. 62). Finally, the machinery of the law-courts is described at considerable length (ch. 63 and fragments), but unfortunately the greater part of this section is hopelessly mutilated.

Here Aristotle's treatise closes. He does not attempt to apply to the history of Athens the principles which he lays down in the *Politics*, nor indeed to extract any lessons from it at all. He was here concerned solely in summarising the facts of that history, leaving the generalisations and deductions to the philosophical work. Facts stated in the *Politeia* are often alluded to in the *Politics*, not unfrequently, as the notes in the present volume try to indicate, in similar words and from the same point of view; but there is no direct reference from the one to the other. One may therefore refrain here from discussing the political lessons which

may be derived from the constitutional history of Athens as represented in this treatise. The point of importance is that we may now fairly believe ourselves to be in the possession of the testimony of Aristotle as to the course and details of that history.

The importance of this testimony will hardly be disputed, whether his work be regarded as a contribution to the lessons of political philosophy, or as an assistance to the reconstruction of the history of a country in which we are so deeply interested as Athens. It is true that we have already Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, and Plutarch as authorities for the same period. But of these Thucydides alone is beyond suspicion, and it is precisely the years covered by his history that are of least importance to the work of Aristotle. Herodotus is brief and often unsatisfactory on the early history of Athens, and has little interest in purely political and constitutional details. Xenophon's accuracy is open to doubt, and his narrative is so incomplete as to admit of considerable supplementing, not to say correction. Plutarch's sources were of too various a quality to allow of his extremely valuable narratives being taken without reservation; and one of the great advantages of the re-appearance of Aristotle's work is that it enables us to test in many points the accuracy of Plutarch's compilations. On the merits of Aristotle as an authority it is not necessary to dwell. His impartiality, his dispassionateness, his matter-of-fact statement of his materials, are as evident here as in any of his other works. He records facts creditable to the democracy and facts which tell against it with an equal air of desiring nothing but the truth. And indeed he occupied a position in which impartiality was not very difficult. The game of Athenian independence was over. Aristotle's own interests were in no way bound up with the credit or with the success of any political party. He was able to stand aloof

and calmly collect the facts of the past history of Athens just as impartially as when he was dealing with the Carthaginians or the Brahmins, with the rules of the syllogism or the structures of the animal creation.

Of the authorities used in his task he tells us little, almost nothing. It is certain that he was acquainted with both Herodotus and Thucydides. Herodotus he quotes by name (ch. 14); and in another passage he mentions, for the purpose of correction, a narrative which is identical with that of Thucydides (ch. 18). For the period of Solon he evidently used Solon's own writings, from which he makes considerable quotations. But for the rest there seems to be nothing to show what his sources were. Only, from the detailed way in which he describes the constitutions of Draco or of Cleisthenes, from the precise dates which are so frequently given in his narrative (which enable us to fix several events with an exactness hitherto impossible), it is clear that he did not rest upon tradition alone, but was making use of written records of some kind or another. Fortunately it is not of so much importance to identify his actual sources as in the case of such an author as Plutarch. Aristotle took care to sift his evidence for himself, instead of leaving it to be done by posterity, and when he clearly and positively states a fact his statement is not lightly to be put aside.

This Introduction is only the first word upon a subject on which the last word cannot be spoken for a long time. The whole work opens up possibilities of discussion in every direction, and raises questions which can only be settled by a consensus of opinion after they have been examined and considered by scholars of all countries. In the present edition the matter of most importance is the text, and every effort has been made to reproduce it as accurately as possible. There remain not a few passages,

however, which still require emendation by conjecture, in some of which the reading of the MS. is completely lost, while in others a few faint traces of letters remain which will serve as tests of the accuracy of any proposed restoration. For the rest, the notes represent a first attempt to estimate the bearing of the new material on the received versions of Athenian history.

The text has been divided into chapters for convenience of reference, but the beginnings of the original columns of the MS. are indicated in the margin. Square brackets have been used to mark words or letters which have been supplied where the MS. is illegible, and words which appear to have been accidentally omitted in the MS. are supplied between angular brackets. The few cases in which the reading of the MS. has not been followed in the text are recorded in the notes, while passages in which the MS. reading appears to be corrupt, but which have not been altered in the text, are marked by *obeli.*

F. G. K.

INTRODUCTION
TO THE THIRD EDITION.

A FEW words of introduction may serve to explain the object of the present edition of the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία. The first and second editions (the latter being an immediate reprint of the former to supply the first demand, with only a few corrections) having been exhausted, it has been represented that a revision of the *editio princeps* might be of some service to English students, especially as, up to the present time, no independent study of the original MS. has been undertaken, which might state the bearing of the testimony of the MS. on the various emendations which have been proposed since the first appearance of the work. Those who have most used the MS. or the facsimile of it know best that in very many passages words must be conjectured before they can be read, and that faint indications of letters may often be interpreted in different ways. Hence no one can be less surprised than the editor that the ingenuity of other scholars and continued work on the papyrus have led to the decipherment of some passages which were left blank in the first edition, and to the correct reading of others which had been mis-read. The first purpose of the present edition is, consequently, to offer a revised version of the text, in which full attention has been paid to the conjectures of others and to the readings which have been extracted, or thought to be

extracted, from the facsimile; and the opportunity has also been taken to revise, to some extent, the historical notes by which the text is accompanied.

For the execution of this revision the materials, in addition to the repeated study of the papyrus itself, are many and various. In the first place must be mentioned the two recensions of the text, based upon collations of the facsimile, which appeared almost simultaneously during the past summer, the first by G. Kaibel and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, the second by H. van Herwerden and J. van Leeuwen. The names of these scholars are sufficient to guarantee the value of their contributions to the textual criticism of the work; but, in addition to this, both pairs of editors have devoted much time and labour to the collation of the autotype facsimile of the MS. The difficulty of such a task can only be understood by those who have attempted the same undertaking. The original MS. is not always easy to read; but the difficulty of decipherment is greatly increased when the decipherer is forced to use a photograph, which, however well and carefully prepared, is inevitably (in the case of a stained and dark-coloured papyrus) less clear than the original. Shadows and fibres of papyrus assume the appearance of ink-strokes, and only a reference to the MS. itself can save the most brilliant decipherer from errors arising from this cause. In spite of these obstacles, it must gladly be recognised that both the German and the Dutch editors have accomplished their task admirably, and have in many cases arrived at the correct readings of passages which had hitherto baffled decipherment. Unfortunately the Dutch editors took no steps to have their readings of the obscurer passages collated with the MS., and they have consequently at times fallen into very natural errors of the kind just alluded to; and it is further to be regretted that they had not seen a list of tolerably certain corrections from the

MS. of the readings of the first edition, which appeared in the *Classical Review* for June 1891. This, however, affects only a comparatively small number of details, and does not greatly detract from the value of an edition which (although several of the emendations adopted in it appear unnecessary) has considerably advanced the textual criticism of the newly discovered classic, and has been of great assistance in the preparation of the present text. The collection in the notes of the principal conjectures which have been offered for the improvement of the text and the *observationes palaeographicae* appended to the volume have been of special use; while the detailed *index verborum* supplies a want which many scholars have felt. The German editors, though they do not give these additional aids, are more successful in their extraction of the MS. readings, and more conservative in their retention of them. Prof. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff has, moreover, devoted much pains to the correct reading and restoration of the mutilated and defaced fragments of the fourth roll of the papyrus; and the brilliant results achieved out of such unpromising materials, resulting in the restoration to Aristotle of several additional paragraphs, deserve the greatest admiration. It would be impertinent in the present editor to attempt to commend the work of scholars of such eminence as these, but it may briefly be stated that it is only the advantage of having the original MS. to work from which justifies the independent views expressed in this volume, and that it is to be wished that, in order to settle the most doubtful points, a separate study of the MS. may be undertaken by some independent scholar of recognised palaeographical experience.

An Italian recension of the text has also appeared, edited by C. Ferrini, with a translation attached. This, however, does not represent a fresh study of the MS. or facsimile, but is a revision of the text of the *editio princeps*

upon conjectural grounds; hence, though useful, it is not so important as the two works just mentioned. The translations of Kaibel and Kiessling, Poland, Reinach, and Zuretti have also been frequently consulted. Treatises on the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία have been written in all languages and of all kinds, and many of these have been made available (chiefly by the kindness of their authors) for the preparation of the present volume. A list of these is given at the end of this Introduction; among the most useful may be mentioned those of Messrs. Newman, Macan, Weil, Keil, Gomperz, and Meyer, and the detailed examination of the chronology of the treatise by Adolf Bauer; while the treatises of Cauer and Rühl are interesting as representing the case of those who take the most adverse view of the value and authenticity of the work. References to some of the opinions expressed by these writers will be found in the notes.

There remain the emendations of single passages which have been made by various scholars at home and abroad. Emendations have indeed been made ὅλῳ τῷ θυλάκῳ, and if a larger proportion of them has not been adopted in the present edition, it is not so much from a want of recognition of the ability of their proposers, as from a doubt as to the extent to which conjectural emendation is admissible. The recent discoveries of very early MSS. of classical authors do not produce a very exalted idea of the success of modern ingenuity in restoring ancient texts, except in the most obvious details; and though a MS. may be wrong, the chances seem to be largely against a conjecture going right[1]. The evidence afforded by the Petrie

[1] Two somewhat remarkable instances of the danger of conjectural emendation, even where apparently most justifiable, are provided by the present MS. In ch. 12, l. 22, the MS. reads δήιον, which was altered in the 1st ed. to δήιοι, in accordance with Plut. *Sol.* 16, where the passage is quoted. But the MSS. of Plutarch have δήιον, and δήιοι was only a conjecture of Reiske's, adopted by Bergk. Again, in ch. 43, l. 29, the MS. reads ἐπιχειροτονίαν, but the editions

Papyri, so far as it goes, tends to show that our texts have already suffered from the application of mechanical rules of style and diction on the part of the Alexandrian critics ; and hence it appears to be safer to err on the side of altering too little than on that of altering too much. At the same time many alterations of the text as originally printed are unquestionably necessary, and emendations which it was not thought right to attempt in the first edition may reasonably be introduced in a revision. For these improvements acknowledgment has to be made to a large number of scholars of all countries. The editor of the *Classical Review*, in particular, has done great service to all students of the subject, not only by his own conjectures, but also by his collection of the emendations which had been proposed in more ephemeral publications. It is impossible to enumerate all those who have contributed something to the revision of the text; but special acknowledgment should be made of the assistance derived from the work of Professors J. E. B. Mayor, Blass, and van Herwerden, and Messrs. Richards, Wyse, and Kontos. The decipherment of a few passages of particular difficulty is due to the experience of Dr. K. Wessely. It has not been thought necessary to increase the bulk of the textual notes by ascribing to those who happened to be the first to point them out the correction of obvious errors in the first edition ; but in all other cases it is hoped that the obligations of the editor have been duly acknowledged. No doubt when the promised editions (including collations of the MS.) of Diels, Blass, Sandys, and Haussoullier have appeared, the materials for fixing the text will be largely

of the Lex. rhet. Cantabrig., in which this passage is quoted, give προχειροτονίαν, on which authority the text is altered in the edition of Kaibel and Wilamowitz. But the MS. of the Lexicon has ἐπιχειροτονίαν, and προχειροτονίαν is merely a conjecture by Meier, adopted as certain ('bene Meierus correxit') by Houtsma. The independent evidence of the present MS. must be decisive in both passages.

increased; meanwhile it is hoped that good use has been made of the materials already at hand.

On the general question of the value and authenticity of the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία much has been written, but it would be premature as yet to say that any definite result has been arrived at. English scholars have, for the most part, expressed themselves more or less tentatively against the attribution of it to Aristotle; the leading French and German scholars, on the other hand, find no difficulty in accepting its authenticity. The judgments of different writers vary remarkably, almost ludicrously, both as to the literary style and as to the historical insight and intellectual capacity shown in the work. While not a few critics praise the clear arrangement of materials, the precise and masterly indication of the principal landmarks of Athenian constitutional history, others find the treatise badly arranged, obscurely expressed, and silent as to facts of great importance. The last argument, based upon supposed omissions of important facts, is one which requires great discretion in its use. The author of the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία, whoever he was, was not writing for the nineteenth century after Christ, neither was he composing a detailed history of the constitution of Athens. He was writing a sketch of that history for the benefit of the general public of his own day. He had to omit much, to assume a certain knowledge in his readers, to pass lightly over matters which were well known and on which he had nothing to add to the accepted version, to dwell with greater detail on subjects on which he desired to correct (tacitly or expressly) the views of his predecessors or to add some details of his own. Consequently, to conclude that he cannot be Aristotle because he does not quote inscriptions or laws which we should like to see, because he does not mention Alcibiades or Hyperbolus (neither of them persons of any real *constitutional* im-

portance), because he alludes casually to persons or events without giving any account of them in their chronological place, is a fatally uncritical method of procedure.

With criticism in this very unsettled state (and it is inevitable that it should be so for some time to come), no one can do much more (except by detailed examination of the style and the statements of the work) than express for himself the impression produced upon him by the study of it; and that, in the present instance, it is not worth while to do at any length. But the statement may be emphasised which was made in the Introduction to the first edition, that at present the burden of proof lies upon those who dispute the authenticity of the work. Putting aside the hypothesis of a modern forgery, which no one has yet propounded or is likely to propound, the facts as to the appearance in this work of the quotations in ancient writers prove beyond a doubt that this is the treatise which was known to the ancients as ἡ τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία. No doubt is ever expressed in any ancient author as to the correctness of the ascription to Aristotle; but how far back this ascription can actually be traced is another matter. Simplicius, by his phrase ἐν ταῖς γνησίαις αὐτοῦ πολιτείαις (*in Cat.* f. 4), shows that criticism was alive to the question of the authenticity of the constitutional treatises passing under the name of Aristotle in the fifth century of our era, and it is clear that the *Athenian Constitution* never fell under suspicion; but this leaves a considerable interval since the date of Aristotle. It is certain, however, that Pollux used it as a work of primary authority, and that Plutarch regarded it as undoubtedly Aristotle's; further, that Strabo, in the first century before Christ, refers to αἱ Ἀριστοτέλους πολιτεῖαι collectively (VII. p. 321), and specifically to the sections on Aetolia, Acarnania, Leucas, Megara, Opus, and apparently to those on Argos, Epidamnus, Elis, Tenedos, and Chalcis, in all cases using

the name of Aristotle. Whether the evidence can be carried further back depends on a well-known passage in Polybius (exc. XII. 5), in which the views of Aristotle as to the foundation of the Locrian community are quoted at length, and are said to have been assailed by Timaeus, who died shortly after 264 B.C. It is not expressly stated that the quotation is from the Πολιτεῖαι, but that is the only reasonable supposition, and the passage is placed under this head in Rose's edition of the fragments of Aristotle. In this case there is evidence that the generation succeeding Aristotle regarded some at least of the Πολιτεῖαι as for all practical purposes the work of the philosopher himself. Whether Philochorus, writing at the close of the fourth century B.C., referred to the *Athenian Constitution* as Aristotle's, as has been stated by a competent American critic, may require further demonstration [1]; but he certainly seems to have used the work as one of some authority. It does not, then, seem too much to say that the unanimous testimony of antiquity, probably dating back to the generation which followed the composition of the treatise, ascribed it to Aristotle; and this should surely constitute a *prima facie* case in favour of the authenticity of the work, which ought not to be rejected except upon really strong grounds. What precisely is meant by 'Aristotelian authorship' may be another question, upon which few persons would care to dogmatise. It may not be inconsistent with the existing evidence to hold that the great philosopher caused this and similar works to be prepared by his pupils, on outlines laid down by himself and under his revision; but the evidence does unquestionably seem to show that it was written in the lifetime of Aristotle, and that he was con-

[1] This further demonstration has been now supplied by the critic referred to, Dr. J. H. Wright, in the *American Journal of Philology*, XII, no. 3, pp. 310–317. A copy of this article, by Dr. Wright's kindness, has been received just as this sheet was going to press. The demonstration does not, it is true, amount to absolute proof, but certainly to a strong presumption.

tent to publish it under his name and with the stamp of his authority. If this be so, it matters comparatively little for historical purposes whether the actual words in which it stands are those of Aristotle himself or of a pupil; yet even on this point the burden of proof lies with the sceptics. The argument from style rests chiefly on individual impressions, and it is notoriously difficult to apply it to such an author as Aristotle. The number of *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* in his unquestioned works is large; and we have no other historical work, and indeed no other work written for the general public at all, with which to compare it. No recognised Aristotelian scholar has yet ventured to declare it to be impossible that the language should be Aristotle's. Under these circumstances, caution upon this head is advisable; and he may laugh best who laughs last.

The presumption in favour of Aristotelian authorship might be pressed further by arguing that the views expressed in this treatise are in accordance with those held by Aristotle in the *Politics*, the only passage in the latter which conflicts irreconcileably with the *Πολιτεία* occurring in the probably unauthentic final chapter of the second book (*cf.* 'Α. π. ch. 4, l. 3); while the systematic arrangement, the critical use of materials, and the impartiality of judgment displayed in it are not unworthy of the author of the undisputed works of Aristotle. But the first of these arguments rests on the quotation and discussion of individual passages, which is better reserved for the notes; and the opinion formed upon the other points depends too much on the 'personal equation' of the critic to be worth expressing at length, except by one whose *ipse dixit* on such a question is valuable, unless with the support of a detailed examination for which there is no space here. It must suffice to express the belief that on none of these counts will the verdict necessarily be unfavourable to the authenticity of the work.

Believing then that the treatise bears the authority of Aristotle for historical purposes, and leaving on one side the question of the literary authorship, the historical critic has still to examine its value as a witness to the events of Greek history.

Concerning the second part (cc. 42–end) no question is possible. It is a contemporary sketch of the mechanism of government as it existed about the year 325 B.C., and it is the source from which we have already indirectly derived a great part of our knowledge concerning the Athenian officials. The difference is that we now receive our information at first hand and in an approximately complete form. It is as to the historical section that inquiry is needed. The sketch of Athenian history begins in remote and undefined antiquity, and ends in 403 B.C., nearly eighty years before the composition of the treatise, and twenty years before the birth of Aristotle. Clearly the value of such a sketch depends upon (1) the sources of information available to the writer, and (2) the use made of them. Each consideration is as important as the other; you cannot make bricks without straw, neither with straw can you make them unless you know how to use it. Mr. Macan (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XII. 35–40) has briefly examined the sources, and sums them up as (1) general tradition or agreement (*πάντες σχέδον, οἱ πλείους, κ.τ.λ.*); (2) special traditions and criticisms (*ἔνιοι, οἱ δημοτικοί, τινές, κ.τ.λ.*); (3) individual authorities, such as Solon and Herodotus and other unnamed sources, among which were certainly Thucydides, Xenophon, and a table of archons; (4) skolia; (5) official or quasi-official records, derived perhaps from the *συναγωγὴ ψηφισμάτων* of Craterus; (6) archaeological evidence, such as the *κύρβεις*, but only scantily employed; (7) reconstruction of past institutions from survivals in later days, a method which no doubt requires careful criticism. Mons. T. Reinach, in the preface to his

translation (pp. xxii–xxvii), adds Theopompus, Cleidemus, Phanodemus, and Androtion to the list of historians more or less certainly used by Aristotle. It is not proposed to carry this examination further here. It is rather with reference to the use made of his materials by the author that it is desired to add a word of explanation. It was never intended to maintain, in either the Introduction or the notes to the first edition, that the authority of the newly discovered treatise was to be considered as final. The most impartial and painstaking of historians may make mistakes, and the new evidence, especially where it conflicts strikingly with the old, as in relation to Draco and Themistocles, unquestionably requires careful scrutiny; which, however, is a different thing from prompt rejection. But if there is good reason for believing this treatise to be in substance the work of Aristotle, then its statements, whatever its 'sources' may be, have a greater weight than if they proceeded merely from an unknown compiler. We certainly should expect *a priori* that the same qualities of mind which distinguish his other work would also be applied to historical research, and that he would not without sufficient reason either follow or depart from the current tradition. We should remember that he had, for the most part, ampler materials and better means of forming a judgment than we have, and, while not accepting him as infallible, we should not wish to depart lightly from his conclusions.

In the present edition the textual notes have been separated from the historical, the lines of the chapters (not pages) have been numbered, and the division into sections by Kaibel and von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff has also been given, in order to facilitate the identification of references to other editions. A complete collation has been made of the readings of the editions of Kaibel-Wilamowitz (denoted by K-W.) and Herwerden-Leeuwen (denoted by

H-L.) which differ from those adopted in the present text; and a selection is given of the more important among the other emendations which have been proposed. In an additional appendix a transcript has been given of the alien matter which appears on the papyrus between the tenth and eleventh columns of the Aristotle (see pp. 216–219), relating to the speech of Demosthenes against Meidias.

The spelling has been revised throughout in accordance with the evidence derivable from inscriptions as to the orthography in use at the date of the composition of the work, as presented by Meisterhans in his *Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften*, 2nd ed., 1888.

Acknowledgment has been made earlier in this Introduction of the sources which have contributed most towards the preparation of this volume; but the editor would wish to add a word of sincere thanks to those scholars, both at home and abroad, from whose kindness and generosity he has derived special help and encouragement. To mention all who have gone out of their way to show friendliness would be impossible; but from Professor J. E. B. Mayor, Dr. H. Jackson, Dr. J. E. Sandys, Professor Th. Gomperz, Professor G. Kaibel, Professor U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, and Mons. B. Haussoullier he has received such constant kindness, both in private communications and in published writings, that it is a duty as well as a pleasure to acknowledge it. Dr. Sandys has added to these obligations by taking the trouble to communicate many suggestions and corrections while the sheets have been passing through the press. Finally, Professor F. Blass has generously allowed the editor to make use of the results which his ingenuity and experience have derived from a collation of the facsimile. Unfortunately the printing of the present text had proceeded too far for it to be possible to use this new material in the earlier part of the treatise (*e.g.* ch. 2, l. 10 *οἱ δανεισμοὶ πᾶσιν*, 4, l. 28 *ἦσαν οἱ δανεισμοί*,

the omission of *αὐτῶν* in 15, l. 26, 16, l. 52 *καί* for *ἐστί*, 18, l. 17 *μετεχόντων πολλῶν*, which are at least possible; and 12, l. 56 *ἐτράφην* or *ἐγράφην* for *ἐστράφην*, which is certain); but in three or four other passages Professor Blass's reading has been thankfully adopted, notably in 42, l. 44, where he has unquestionably solved a problem which had baffled all previous decipherers. Professor Blass has also made further progress with the decipherment and arrangement of the mutilated fragments, having discerned that fragments 3 and 1 on p. 199 contain the beginnings respectively of ll. 1–9 and 11–21 of col. 35, while he has also arrived at some new readings in col. 36. To have incorporated all these results would, however, have caused considerable delay, and it would moreover have been an abuse of his generosity so far to anticipate his forthcoming edition.

F. G. K.

THE following is a list of the principal works connected with the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* which have come under the notice of the editor, and to most of which reference is made in the notes to this edition. Some additional articles will be found in the list given by Dr. P. Meyer, in the work quoted below.

Aristotelis ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ. Ediderunt G. KAIBEL et U. de WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF. Berolini, 1891. A second edition of this has also appeared, with a few alterations.

De Republica Atheniensium: Aristotelis qui fertur liber ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ. Post Kenyonem ediderunt H. van HERWERDEN et J. van LEEUWEN, J. F. Accedunt manuscripti apographum, observationes palaeographicae cum tabulis IV, indices locupletissimi. Lugduni Batavorum, 1891.

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ. Aristotele, La Costituzione degli Ateniesi. Testo Greco, versione Italiana, introduzione e note, per cura

di C. Ferrini, Prof. Ord. di Diritto nell' Università di Modena. Milano, 1891.

G. KAIBEL and A. KIESSLING: Aristoteles Schrift vom Staatswesen der Athener, verdeutscht von G. K. und A. K. Zweite verbesserte Auflage. Strassburg, 1891.

F. POLAND: Aristoteles' Staat der Athener, übersetzt von Dr. F. P. Berlin, 1891. Contains some useful notes.

T. REINACH: Aristote, La République Athénienne, traduite en Français pour la première fois par T. R. Paris, 1891. With an introduction.

C. O. ZURETTI: Aristotele, La Costituzione di Atene, tradotta da C. O. Z. Firenze e Roma, 1891.

W. L. NEWMAN: review of Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens, *Classical Review*, V. 155–164.

R. W. MACAN: ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ. *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XII. 17–40.

Classical Review, vol. V *passim*: notes and emendations by many scholars, partly collected from other journals.

A. BAUER: litterarische und historische Forschungen zu Aristoteles ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ. München, 1891. Includes especially a thorough examination of the chronology of the πεντηκονταετία.

F. BLASS: emendations in *Litterarisches Centralblatt*, No. 10.

A. BRIEGER: die Verfassungsgeschichte von Athen, nach Aristoteles' neu angefundener Schrift. *Unsere Zeit*, II. 18–36. Descriptive article.

F. CAUER: Hat Aristoteles die Schrift vom Staate der Athener geschrieben? ihr Ursprung und ihr Wert für die ältere Athenische Geschichte. Stuttgart, 1891.

O. CRUSIUS: Die Schrift vom Staate der Athener, und Aristoteles über die Demokratie. *Philologus*, L., pp. 173–178.

H. DIELS: article in *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung*, No. 7.

A. GENNADIOS: emendations in Ἀκρόπολις, March 19, 1891, *et seqq.*

TH. GOMPERZ: Aristoteles und seine neuentdeckte Schrift von der Staatsverfassung der Athener. *Deutsche Rundschau*, May 1891. Descriptive article, separately reprinted.

TH. GOMPERZ: Über das neuentdeckte Werk des Aristoteles und die Verdächtiger seiner Echtheit. *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, nr. x-xi. With special reference to collections of 'Unaristotelean words and phrases' in the *Classical Review*.

———— Die Schrift vom Staatswesen der Athener und ihr neuester Beurtheiler. Eine Streitschrift. Wien, 1891. Chiefly directed against the article of F. Rühl, *vide infra*.

B. HAUSSOULLIER: descriptive article in *Revue Critique*, No. 10.

F. HULTSCH: Das Pheidonische Maszsystem nach Aristoteles. Note in Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher für class. Philologie*, Hft. 4, p. 263.

B. KEIL: descriptive article in *Berl. Philol. Wochenschrift*, No. 17–20; separately reprinted.

K. S. KONTOS: emendations in Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher* and in Ἀθηνᾶ, vol. III. pp. 289–400.

B. LACON: emendations in Ἐφημερίς, March 20th, 1891.

J. van LEEUWEN: notes and emendations in *Mnemosyne*, vol. XIX, April 1891.

P. MEYER: Des Aristoteles Politik und die Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, nebst einer Litteratur-Übersicht. Bonn, 1891.

C. MICHEL: Un nouveau Traité d'Aristote. Reprinted from *Revue de l'Instruction Publique en Belgique*, tom. XXXIV, pts. 2 and 4.

G. MÜLLER: article in *Rivista di Filologia ed Istruzione Classica*, XIX. pp. 551–557.

E. PAIS: article in the same periodical, pp. 557–569.

F. RÜHL: Über die Schrift vom Staate der Athener. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, pp. 426–464.

B. SAINT-HILAIRE: Sur la Constitution d'Athènes. *Revue bleue*, March 21st, 1891.

R. SCHÖLL: Aristoteles' Staat der Athener. Descriptive article, reprinted from *Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung*, No. 107–108.

H. WEIL: article in *Journal des Savants*, April 1891.

[J. H. WRIGHT]: article in *The Nation*, vol. LII, pp. 382–384. New York, May 7th, 1891.

ABBREVIATIONS IN USE IN THE MS.

ʒ	=	αι.	μ\	=	μετά.
α\	=	ἀνά.	ο′	=	ουν.
ϟ	=	αὐτήν (col. 9, l. 8).	π\	=	παρά.
γ′	=	γάρ.	π′	=	περί or περ.
δ′	=	δε.	σ′	=	σύν.
δ\	=	διά.	τϟ	=	ται.
\	=	εἶναι.	τ\	=	την.
/	=	ἐστί.	τ’	=	της.
//	=	εἰσί.	τ′	=	των.
θ′	=	θαι.	υ’	=	ὑπέρ.
κ′	=	και.	υ\	=	ὑπό.
κ\	=	κατά.	⋇	=	χρόνος.
μ′	=	μεν.			

Where the expanded word has not been accented in the above list, it is to be understood that the abbreviation is used for the syllable in question when it occurs as part of a word, as well as when it stands by itself or (in the case of prepositions) in composition : e.g. *αναγκ′ον, γεγενημ′ος.*

In addition to these there are occasional abbreviations of the terminations of words : e.g. *στρατηγ*^{o} for *στρατηγός*, *μα*^{χ} for *μάχην*, *γενεσ*^{θ} for *γενέσθαι*. These are, however, rarely used, and present no difficulty.

It may be mentioned that in three cases accents are found in the MS., and in two cases breathings. *εκμαρτυρῶν* (col. 3, l. 9) and *νομοφυλακεῖν* (col. 3, l. 26) have circumflex accents, *ὁ* (col. 12, l. 3) has a rough breathing of an angular shape, and *ἡγῶνται* (col. 13, l. 11) has both rough breathing and circumflex accent. The first three cases occur in the first of the four hands in which the MS. is written; the last is an addition to the second hand, presumably by the person who has corrected that hand throughout, *viz.* the writer of the first hand.

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΟΥΣ

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ.

I. . . . [Μ]ύρωνος καθ' ἱερῶν ὀμόσαντες ἀριστινδην. καταγνωσθέντος δὲ τοῦ ἄγο[υ]ς [αὐ]τοὶ μὲν

2. *καταγνωσθέντος*: corrected to *καθαρθέντος* in MS. *αὐτοί*: the *τ* is doubtful; 1st ed. [*νεκρ*]*οί*. H-L. [*οἱ νεκ*]*ροί*, but there is not room for the article. K-W. [*αὐτ*]*οί*, after Kirchhoff's conjecture.

CH. I. The opening words evidently belong to a narrative of the revolutionary attempt of Cylon and its consequences. The date of this attempt has always been doubtful. We know from Herodotus (V. 71) that Cylon was an Olympic victor, and his victory is placed by Africanus in 640 B.C. It is also certain that his attempt was made in an Olympic year; but it has generally been assumed that it occurred after the legislation of Draco, whose date is given by Jerome as 621 B.C., and it is therefore usually placed in the chronologies at 620 or 616 B.C. The assumption is natural, from the way in which Plutarch (who certainly used Aristotle's work in preparing his life of Solon) brings the attempt of Cylon into connection with the career of Solon, making the visit of Epimenides to purify the city occur only shortly before Solon's legislation and long after the career of the latter as a public man had begun. Plutarch does not, however, mention how long a time intervened between the slaughter of the accomplices of Cylon and the expiation effected by the expulsion of the Alcmeonidae and the purification by Epimenides; and the present work makes it certain that the date of Cylon is anterior to that of Draco. This is probable on other grounds. The attempt of Cylon is spoken of as that of a young man, aided by companions of his own age (*προσποιησάμενος ἑταιρηΐην τῶν ἡλικιωτέων*, Herod. *l. c.*); whereas a man who had won an Olympic victory in 640 B.C. would be a middle-aged man in 620 or 616 B.C. Moreover, according to Plutarch's own narrative (*Solon*, 12) it is clear that sufficient time had elapsed before the expulsion of the Alcmeonidae for the party of Cylon, which had

ἐκ τῶν τάφων ἐξεβλήθησαν, τὸ δὲ γένος αὐτῶν ἔφυγεν ἀειφυγίαν. Ἐ[πι]μενίδης δ' ὁ Κρὴς ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐκάθηρε τὴν πόλιν.

2. *Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα συνέβη στασιάσαι τούς τε γνωρίμους καὶ τὸ πλῆθος πολὺν χρόνον †τὸν δῆμον. ἦν* 2

at the time been nearly exterminated, to recover strength and carry on a vigorous feud with its opponents. It is therefore probable that the attempt of Cylon should be placed about the year 632 B.C., or 628 B.C. at the latest. A similar conclusion had already been arrived at by Busolt (*Handb. d. griech. Geschichte*, I. 498). Whether the date of the visit of Epimenides, which is assigned to about 596 B.C., should be altered is another matter. Aristotle in the present passage may very probably be merely carrying on the narrative of the rising of Cylon to its conclusion, and the words *μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα* which follow may easily refer to the attempt itself and not to the visit of Epimenides. Hence there is no sufficient reason for supposing Plutarch, who had seen Aristotle's work, to have made so gross a mistake as to assign to the lifetime of Solon (with whom he states Epimenides to have associated freely) an event which occurred before the legislation of Draco. The feud arising out of the *Κυλώνειον ἄγος* (the memories of which were still active in Greece at the period of the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war) had evidently lasted for a considerable time before the expulsion of the Alcmeonidae; and it was not till some years after this that the visit of Epimenides took place.

1. *Μύρωνος*: Myron is mentioned by Plutarch as the accuser of the Alcmeonidae at the trial to which Solon persuaded them to submit. The word *ἀριστίνδην* occurs in the same passage (*κριθῆναι τριακοσίων ἀριστίνδην δικαζόντων*), referring to the selection of the judges on that occasion.

2. *καταγνωσθέντος*: both the tense and the context seem to make *καταγνωσθέντος* preferable to the correction *καθαρθέντος*.

3. *ἐκ τῶν τάφων ἐξεβλήθησαν*: both Thucydides (I. 126) and Plutarch (*l. c.*) mention the disinterment of the bones of the members of the Alcmeonid clan who had died since the affair of Cylon.

4. *Ἐπιμενίδης*: *cf.* Plutarch, *l. c.*

II. 2. *τὸν δῆμον*: these words have been obelised as being probably a gloss on *τὸ πλῆθος*. Professor J. E. B. Mayor, however, suggests that *στασιάσαι* is transitive and *τὸν δῆμον* the object. In favour of this it may be argued that it is improbable that a gloss should be required at the date of this MS. on so common a word as *πλῆθος*. On the other hand *δῆμος* does not seem to be used in this treatise as denoting the whole state, except with the collateral sense that the state was a

γὰρ [τότε] ἡ πολιτεία τ[οῖς τε] ἄλλοις ὀλιγαρχικὴ πᾶσι, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐδούλευον οἱ πένητε[ς τ]οῖς πλουσίοις καὶ αὐτοὶ [καὶ τ]ὰ τέκνα καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες, καὶ ἐκαλοῦντο πελάται καὶ ἑκτημόροι· κατὰ ταύτην γὰρ τὴν

II. 4. *καὶ δὴ καί*: the second *καί* is added above the line. 6. *κατὰ ταύτην τὴν μίσθωσιν*: so K-W.; *κατα* (*κ'*) is doubtful in MS., but suits the visible remains. MS. *ταυτ` τ` μισθωσ*, not *ταυτ' τ'*, as in 1st ed. and H-L.

democracy. The most doubtful cases are ch. 14, l. 8 (*ἐπαναστὰς . . τῷ δήμῳ*) and ch. 15, ll. 17, 20 (*παρελόμενος τοῦ δήμου τὰ ὅπλα*), and even here there is the sense of an attack on the democracy by a despot. If *στασιάσαι* is transitive, one would rather have expected *τὴν πόλιν* as the object. Supposing *τὸν δῆμον* to be an addition, it was probably written as a correction of *τὸ πλῆθος*, not as an explanation.

4. *ἐδούλευον*: in earlier times, according to Herodotus (VI. 137), there were no slaves (*οἰκέται*) in Attica; but he is speaking of the time when the Pelasgian community living under Hymettus was still independent. As at Rome, so in Attica, the pressure of debt very early brought the poorest class of the community into a position of serfdom, if not of slavery.

6. *πελάται καὶ ἑκτημόροι*: Photius quotes Aristotle as his authority for the word *πελάται*, which he explains as *οἱ μισθῷ δουλεύοντες, ἐπεὶ τὸ πέλας ἐγγύς, οἷον ἔγγιστα διὰ πενίαν προσιόντες*, and again as *οἱ παρὰ τοῖς πλησίον ἐργαζόμενοι· καὶ θῆτες οἱ αὐτοὶ καὶ ἑκτημόροι, ἐπειδὴ ἕκτῳ μέρει τῶν καρπῶν εἰργάζοντο τὴν γῆν*. *Cf.* also Pollux III. 82, *πελάται δὲ καὶ θῆτες ἐλευθέρων ἐστὶν ὀνόματα διὰ πενίαν ἐπ' ἀργυρίῳ δουλευόντων* and IV. 165, *ἑκτημόροι, οἱ πελάται παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς*. *ἑκτημόροι*, not *ἑκτημόριοι*, seems to be the proper form. *πελάται* is also used to represent the Latin *clientes* in Plut. *Rom.* 13 *etc.* Plutarch has drawn from this passage of Aristotle in his description of the state of things immediately before the legislation of Solon (*Sol.* 13). See Rose's *Fragmenta*, frag. 351.

ἑκτημόροι: interpreted by Photius (*l. c.*) as those who retained one-sixth of the produce, and by Plutarch (*Sol.* 13) as those who paid one-sixth to their landlords. With Photius agrees Schol. Plat. Euthyph. 4 C.; Hesychius gives the first explanation *s. v.* *ἑκτημόροι*, the second *s. v.* *ἐπίμορτος*. The former seems most in accordance with the general description of the depressed state of the peasantry; but the latter is the natural interpretation of the words of Aristotle. Gomperz has pointed out (*Die Schrift vom Staatswesen der Athener*, pp. 45-48) that the burdensomeness of any rent depends on the general condition of agriculture in the country. *μίσθωσις* must mean 'rent,' not 'wages' as it is rendered in most of the translations.

μίσθωσιν [εἰ]ργάζοντο τῶν πλουσίων τοὺς ἀγρούς. ἡ δὲ πᾶσα γῆ δι' ὀλίγων ἦν καὶ εἰ μὴ τὰς μισθώσεις [ἀπ]οδιδοῖεν ἀγώγιμοι καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ παῖδες ἐγίγνοντο, καὶ [δε]δ[εμένοι τοῖς δανείσ]ασιν ἐπὶ τοῖς σώμασιν ἦσαν μέχρι Σόλωνος· οὗτος δὲ πρῶτος ἐγέν[ετο τοῦ] δή[μου] προστάτης. χαλεπώτατον μὲν οὖν 3
καὶ πικρότατον ἦν τοῖς πολλοῖς τῶν κατὰ τὴν πολιτείαν τὸ [δουλεύ]ειν. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐδυσχέραινον· οὐδενὸς γάρ, ὡς εἰπεῖν, ἐτύγχανον μετέχοντες.

3. *Ἦν δ' ἡ τάξις τῆς ἀρχαίας πολιτείας τῆς πρὸ Δράκοντος [τοιάδε]. τὰς μὲν ἀρχὰς [καθί]στασαν ἀριστίνδην καὶ πλουτίνδην· ἦρχον δὲ [τὸ] μὲν πρω-*

10. *ἐγίγνοντο* : MS. *εγινοντο*, *cf.* Meisterhans, p. 141. *καὶ . . . δανείσασιν* : K-W. *καὶ γάρ*, but there does not appear to be room for the *γάρ*. H-L. *ὑπόχρεῳ γάρ*, but the MS. forbids. 14. *τὸ δουλεύειν*, K-W.'s reading, is in accordance with the visible remains. H-L. [*τὸ τῆς γῆς μὴ κρατ*]*εῖν*.

10. *δεδεμένοι τοῖς δανείσασιν*: the reading is partly conjectural, and the whole expression is rather unusual; but it will bear the sense required and is in accordance with the traces remaining visible in the MS. *δεδεμένοι* is moreover confirmed by the parallel expression at the end of ch. 4. For the phrase *ἐπὶ τοῖς σώμασιν* *cf.* Plutarch, *l. c.*

12. *τοῦ δήμου προστάτης* : this title, an echo from a later time, but still having a legitimate meaning as 'champion of the people,' is again applied to Solon, together with Pisistratus, Cleisthenes, and others, in ch. 28.

III. 1. *τῆς ἀρχαίας πολιτείας* : in the first part of the work, now missing, Aristotle had mentioned the settlement of Attica by Ion and the changes introduced by Theseus (*cf.* fragg. 343, 346); but materials were probably wanting for the assignment to precise dates and persons of the various items of the early constitutional history. Such an account would inevitably have been largely mythical; and hence it appears that Aristotle contented himself with giving a summary in this place of the development of the constitution up to the date of Draco. There is therefore no contradiction between the scheme here adopted and the recapitulation in ch. 41.

3. *ἦρχον δὲ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον διὰ βίου*: the reading of the MS. is somewhat doubtful, owing to the faintness of the writing, but the sense is

2 τ[ον διὰ βίου], μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα [δεκ]αετίαν. μέγισται δὲ καὶ πρῶται τῶν ἀρχῶν ἦσαν βασ[ιλεύς καὶ

III. 4. διὰ βίου K-W., H-L.; there is room for this in the lacuna, but the latter part of the space shows no trace of having been written on. 1st ed. ἀεί. 5. βασιλεύς: 1st ed. βασιλεὺς τε, corr. Rutherford.

certain. The noticeable point is the combination of the mention of *election* (καθίστασαν ἀριστίνδην καὶ πλουτίνδην) with the retention of office for life. This must refer to the period of the Medontidae, a period at present involved in great obscurity. It has been generally agreed that the stories told of the alterations in the constitution after the death of Codrus imply some limitation of the kingly power; and the present passage does something to elucidate the point. It is probably not the case (see the following note) that the title of king was abolished; but it seems certain that the powers of the king were considerably altered, and that for a hereditary and nearly autocratic monarchy was substituted an elective life-magistracy confined to the members of the kingly house, with whom were joined, in varying degrees of subordination, a Polemarch and an Archon. How this is to be reconciled with the tradition of the gratitude of the Athenians to Codrus is another matter; but we may perhaps connect with it the story of the dispute which arose as to the succession of the lame Medon and the consequent secession of a large body of emigrants who led the Ionian colonisation of Asia Minor. In them we may see the malcontents who were unwilling to accept the new régime; and even the 'lameness' of Medon may be only the traditional representation of the mutilated character of the monarchy enjoyed by him.

5. πρῶται τῶν ἀρχῶν: this account of the origin of the archon's office differs from that which has hitherto been generally accepted. In the absence of other evidence the legendary account has naturally been adopted, to the effect that the rule of the kings was followed first by that of the Medontidae, who held office for life but without the title of king, and perhaps with some limitation of authority (Pausanias, IV. 5, 10, calls it an ἀρχὴ ὑπεύθυνος), and then by decennial archons possessing the same powers but subject to the limit of time; and that this was again followed by the creation of a board of nine archons, who shared among them the powers of the single ruler. From the account of Aristotle it appears that the office of Polemarch dates back to the period of the kings, at which time, however, it would amount to no more than the position of a commander-in-chief under an unwarlike sovereign; and it does not follow, as Cauer (*Hat Aristoteles*, &c., p. 46) supposes, that the military functions of the sovereign were henceforward always delegated to a Polemarch. The office of ἄρχων came into existence in the time either of Medon or of

πολ]έμαρχος καὶ ἄρ[χων]· τούτων δὲ πρ[ώτ]η μὲν ἡ τοῦ βασιλέως, αὕτη γὰρ ἐν [ἀρχ]ῇ [ἦν,] δευτέρα δ' ἐπικατέστη [ἡ πολε]μαρχία διὰ τὸ γί[γν]εσθαί τινας

7. ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν : K-W. ἐν ἀρχῇ κατέστη, H-L. [πάτριος (in corrigendis) ἐγένετο], but it appears possible to trace most of the letters in the MS., and there is not room for either of these readings. 8. ἡ : added by J. B. Mayor, and so H-L., but not K-W. It is doubtful whether there is room for it in the MS., but it might easily have fallen out. γίγνεσθαι : K.-W. γενέσθαι.

Acastus, *i.e.* at the beginning of the rule of the Medontidae. At this time, however, says Aristotle, the office was of comparatively little importance, and was inferior to both the βασιλεύς and the πολέμαρχος, and it was only at a later period that the ἄρχων took precedence of these magistrates. This throws some light on the constitutional change which took place after the death of Codrus. It would appear that in effect the rule of a board of three was substituted for that of a monarch, or at least that two other magistrates were elevated to positions which detracted considerably from the autocratic authority of the titular governor. A change of this kind would probably also tend to increase the power of the Areopagus. It seems, however, that the old tradition that the name of king gave place to that of archon is inaccurate. There is other evidence tending to show that the title of βασιλεύς still continued in use (*cf.* Busolt, I. 401, and Abbott's *History of Greece*, I. 286, quoting Pausanias, I. 3, 3), and this passage of Aristotle makes it practically certain. The βασιλεύς still continued to rule for life, but associated with him were the Polemarch and the Archon. There is no evidence to show how long the term of office was in their case, but it may be conjectured that they were magistrates elected for a term of years by and from the Eupatrid aristocracy, the actual electing body being, no doubt, as in later times (ch. 8, l. 10), the Areopagus. The abolition of the title of king as that of the chief magistrate of the state probably took place when the decennial system was established. The name was then retained only for sacrificial and similar reasons, and, to mark the fact that the kingly rule was actually at an end, the magistrate bearing the title was degraded to the second position, while the Archon, whose name naturally suggested itself as the best substitute for that of king, was promoted to the titular headship of the state. Dates would then be indicated by the year of the Archon, as previously by the year of the reigning king; and when the office was made annual the Archon became in the full sense of the term ἐπώνυμος, the magistrate from whose name the year was called. The Thesmothetae, as Aristotle proceeds to state, only came into existence at this last-named period, after the abolition of the decennial system (683 B.C., *cf.* Busolt, I. 404).

τῶν βασιλέων τὰ πολέμια μαλ[ακούς, ὅθεν καὶ] τὸν
3 Ἴωνα μετε[πέμ]ψαντο χρεία[ς κ]αταλαβούσης. τελευταία δ᾽ ἡ [τοῦ ἄρχο]ντος· [οἱ] μὲν γὰρ πλείους [ἐ]πὶ Μέδοντος, ἔνιοι δ᾽ ἐπὶ Ἀκάστου φασὶ γενέσθαι [τὴν ἀρχήν· σημεῖον] δ᾽ ἐπιφέρουσιν [ὅτι] οἱ ἐννέα ἄρχοντες ὀμνύουσι [καθάπερ] ἐπὶ Ἀκάστου τὰ ὅρκια ποι[ή]σειν, ὡς ἐπὶ τού[το]υ τῆς βασιλείας παραχωρησάντων τῶν Κοδ[ριδῶν] ἀντὶ τῶν δοθεισῶν τῷ ἄρχοντι δωρεῶν. τοῦτο μὲν οὖν ὁποτέρως ποτ᾽ ἔχει μικρόν, ἐγένετο γὰρ ἐν τούτοις τοῖς χρόνοις· ὅτι δὲ τελευταία τούτων ἐγένετο τῶν ἀρχῶν, [ση]μεῖον καὶ [τὸ] μη[δ]ὲν [τῶν π]ατρίων τὸν ἄρχοντα διοικεῖν ὥσπερ ὁ βασιλεὺς.

9. *ὅθεν καί*: K-W. [*πρῶτον*] *δέ*, but the letters *οθ* seem partly legible. 12. *τὴν ἀρχήν*: K-W. [*ταύτην*]. 14. *τὰ ὅρκια ποιήσειν*: the first five letters are doubtful, but the remains are in accordance with this reading. *ποιήσειν* Wessely, who also suggests *τὰ ἄρτια*; K-W. (after first ed.) [*τῆς*] *πόλ*[*εως ἄ*]*ρξειν*, H-L. (after Platt) [*βασιλέως ἄρξ*]*ειν*. 15. *τούτου τῆς*: so H-L., probably rightly; 1st ed. and K-W. *τῆς ἐ*[*κείνου*]: *τ'* and *το* are sometimes written almost identically in this hand. 18. *ἐγένετο γάρ*: the reading is not certain, but is in accordance with the traces in the MS. K-W. *ἀλλ'* [*οὖν ἐγένε*]*το*, H-L. [*διαφέρει*]. *ἐν τούτοις τοῖς*: the reading is rather doubtful, the *s* of *τούτοις* running into the *τ* of *τοῖς*. K-W. and H-L. give *ἐν τούτοις* ⟨*τοῖς*⟩ 20. *πατρίων*: suggested by Wyse, and with that assistance it is possible to read the rest of the passage.

10. *Ἴωνα*: according to the legend Ion, who was ruling over the Aegialeis, came to the assistance of his grandfather Erechtheus in his war with Eumolpus of Eleusis, and was made commander-in-chief of the Athenians. Herodotus alludes to it, and gives him the title of *στρατάρχης* (VIII. 44); and a scholiast on Aristophanes (*Birds* 1527) actually calls him Polemarch, *πατρῷον δὲ τιμῶσιν Ἀπόλλωνα Ἀθηναῖοι, ἐπεὶ Ἴων ὁ πολέμαρχος Ἀθηναίων ἐξ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Κρεούσης τῆς Ξούθου* [*γυναικὸς*] *ἐγένετο*.

16. *ἀντὶ τῶν δοθεισῶν τῷ ἄρχοντι δωρεῶν*: the first three words are very faint, but the reading seems nearly certain. The expression is somewhat remarkable, but the meaning is clear; 'in his reign the Codridae retired from the kingship in consideration of the prerogatives which were surrendered to the archon." Certain prerogatives were transferred to the archon, and to that extent the Codridae abandoned the kingly power.

καὶ ὁ πολέμαρχος, ἀλλὰ [μόνον τὰ ἐπίθ]ετα. διὸ καὶ νεωστὶ γέγονεν ἡ ἀρχὴ μεγάλη, τοῖς ἐπ[ι]θέτοις αὐξηθ[εῖσα. θεσ]μοθέται δὲ πολλο[ῖ]ς ὕστερον ἔτεσιν ἡρέ- 4 *θησαν, ἤδη κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν αἱρ[ουμένων] τὰς ἀρχάς, ὅπως ἀναγράψαντες τὰ θέσμια φυλάττωσι πρὸς τὴν τῶν [παρανομού]ντων κρίσιν· διὸ καὶ μόνη τῶν ἀρχῶν οὐκ ἐγένετο πλείων [ἢ] ἐνιαύσιος. [οὗτοι] μὲν οὖν χρόνον* 5 *τοσοῦτον προέχουσιν ἄλλων. ᾤκησαν δ' οὐχ ἅμα πάντες οἱ ἐννέα ἄρχοντες, ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν βασιλεὺς ε[ἶ]χε*

21. *μόνον τὰ ἐπίθετα*: K-W. [*ὅλως μηδὲν μ*]*έγα*, H-L. [*καινά τινα ἐπί*]*θετα*. 26. *παρανομούντων*: H-L. [*ἀκοσμού*]*ντων*, which is hardly enough to fill the lacuna. 27. *πλείων*: H-L. emend *πλεῖν*, K-W. *πλεῖον*. 28. *ἄλλων. ᾤκησαν*: MS. *αλληωνησαν*. Dr. H. Jackson prefers *ἀλλήλων. ἦσαν*, and so Blass, K-W., H-L.

21. *ἐπίθετα*: for the contrast between *πάτρια* and *ἐπίθετα* *cf.* Harpocration, *s. v.* *ἐπιθέτους ἑορτάς . . . τὰς μὴ πατρίους, ἄλλως δ' ἐπιψηφισθείσας, ἐπιθέτους ἐκάλουν. ἐλέγετο δὲ παρ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ἄλλα ἐπίθετά τινα, ὁπόσα μὴ πάτρια ὄντα ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλὴ ἐδίκαζεν.*

25. *ἀναγράψαντες*: hitherto, apparently, judicial decisions had not been recorded, and consequently there was no stability in the administration of justice. The Thesmothetae therefore received their name not merely from the fact that they made law by administering it (Thirlwall, II. 17: *Dict. Ant.* art. *Archon*), but from being the first to lay it down in written decisions. There was therefore some written basis of law before the time of Draco; but his legislation was no doubt required in order to give the archons fixed principles to work on and to secure uniformity of administration. Judges' law requires a substratum of fixed and codified law on which to work.

28. *ἄλλων κ.τ.λ.*: *ἀλλήλων* is no doubt nearer to the MS., but it is hardly logical to say that the various archons precede *one another*, and the point of the sentence appears to be to show that the archons were by far the earliest of the Athenian magistrates in point of date. *ἦσαν*, moreover, appears to be rather flat; and in support of *ᾤκησαν* it may be suggested that the ceremony connected with the king-archon's wife seems to indicate that the archons resided in the buildings assigned to them, and did not merely use them for official business. H-L. recognise *ἦσαν* as corrupt, and Herwerden proposes *ἐδίκαζον*, Gennadios *καθίζον*, Kontos *συνῆσαν*, but these (except the last) fail to explain the corruption.

ᾤκησαν κ.τ.λ.: *cf.* Suid. *s. v.* *ἄρχων*: *πρὸ μὲν τῶν Σόλωνος νόμων οὐκ ἐξῆν αὐτοῖς ἅμα δικάζειν, ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν βασιλεὺς καθῆστο παρὰ τῷ καλουμένῳ*

τὸ νῦν καλούμενον Βουκόλιον, πλησίον τοῦ Πρυτανείου (σημεῖον δέ· ἔτι καὶ νῦν γὰρ τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως γυναικὸς ἡ σύμμειξις ἐνταῦθα γίγνεται τῷ Διονύσῳ καὶ ὁ γάμος), ὁ δὲ ἄρχων τὸ Πρυτανεῖον, ὁ δὲ πολέμαρχος τὸ Ἐπιλύκειον· ὃ πρότερον μὲν ἐκαλεῖτο Πολεμαρχεῖον, ἐπεὶ δὲ Ἐπίλυκος ἀνῳκοδόμησε καὶ κατεσκεύασεν αὐτὸ πολεμα[ρχή]σας Ἐπιλύκειον ἐκλήθη· θεσμοθέται δ' εἶχον τὸ Θεσμοθετεῖον. ἐπὶ δὲ Σόλωνος ἅ[π]αντες εἰς τὸ Θεσμοθετεῖον συνῆλθον. κύριοι δ' ἦσαν καὶ τὰς δίκας αὐτοτελεῖς [κρίν]ειν, καὶ οὐχ

32. *σύμμειξις*: MS. *συμμιξις*: *cf.* Meisterhans, p. 144. *γίγνεται*: MS. *γινεται*. *καὶ ὁ γάμος*: expunged as a gloss by H-L. following Rutherford. 36. *πυλεμαρχήσας*: H-L. *πολεμαρ[χῶν]*, against the MS. *Ἐπιλύκειον*: MS. *επιλυκιον*. 39. *αὐτοτελεῖς*: H-L *αὐτοτελ[ῶς]* after J. B. Mayor.

Βουκολίῳ· τὸ δὲ ἦν πλησίον τοῦ Πρυτανείου· ὁ δὲ πολέμαρχος ἐν Λυκείῳ, καὶ ὁ ἄρχων παρὰ τοὺς ἐπωνύμους, καὶ οἱ θεσμοθέται παρὰ τὸ Θεσμοθετεῖον. (Rose, ed. 1886, *Frag.* 413). The residence of the archon is here described as *παρὰ τοὺς ἐπωνύμους*, whereas Aristotle says that he occupied the Prytaneum. The two accounts are not irreconcileable. The statues of the eponymous heroes stood close to the Prytaneum (Schol. Aristoph. *Pax* 1183, *τόπος παρὰ πρυτανεῖον ἐν ᾧ ἑστήκασιν ἀνδριάντες οὓς ἐπωνύμους καλοῦσιν*), and if the archon occupied a wing of the Prytaneum adjoining these statues both descriptions will be satisfied.

31. *τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως γυναικός*: the wife of the king-archon, who was called *βασίλιννα* or *βασίλισσα*, always went through the ceremony of marriage to the god Dionysus at the feast of the Anthesteria. *Cf.* Dem. *contr. Neaer.* c. 76, p. 1371.

34. *Ἐπιλύκειον*: it has generally been supposed that the Polemarch occupied the Lyceum, on the strength of the passage of Suidas quoted above. Hesychius, indeed, under the word *ἐπιλύκειον* describes it as the residence of the Polemarch; but this has generally been written as two words, *ἐπὶ Λύκειον*, and explained in accordance with Suidas. The words of Aristotle, however, show that there was a separate building called the Epilyceum. It does not follow that his version of the origin of its name is correct, and the 'polemarch Epilycus' looks suspiciously like a traditional invention to account for the name. It is more probable that the building was in the neighbourhood of the Lyceum and derived its name from that fact.

38. *κύριοι δ' ἦσαν*: *cf.* Suidas, *l. c.*, *κύριοί τε ἦσαν ὥστε τὰς δίκας αὐτο-*

ὥσπερ νῦν προανακρίνειν. τὰ μὲν οὖν [περὶ] τὰς ἀρχὰς τοῦτον εἶχε τὸν τρόπον. ἡ δὲ τῶν Ἀρεο- 6
παγιτῶν βουλὴ τὴν μὲν τάξιν εἶχε τοῦ διατηρεῖν τοὺς νόμους, διῴκει δὲ τὰ πλεῖστα καὶ τὰ μέγιστα

41. Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν: MS. αρεοπαγειτων, and so in l. 47.

τελεῖς ποιεῖσθαι, ὕστερον δὲ Σόλωνος οὐδὲν ἕτερον αὐτοῖς τελεῖται ἢ μόνον ὑποκρίνουσι τοὺς ἀντιδίκους. It is possible, in the light of this passage, that the verb here should be read as ποιεῖν instead of κρίνειν; but the active is less suitable for such a sense than the middle, and κρίνειν corresponds better with προανακρίνειν.

41. ἡ τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν βουλή: this passage is important, as bearing on the origin and early existence of the Areopagus. Plutarch (*Sol.* 19) mentions that most persons believed Solon to have been the founder of that council, but in disproof of this statement quotes the fact that the Areopagus is referred to in one of Solon's own laws as already existing. The reference to it in the *Politics* as the oligarchical element in Solon's mixed constitution (*Pol.* ii. 12) is no argument against its preexistence; Solon made the constitution a mixed one by adding a democratical element to the oligarchical and aristocratical ones already existing. The present passage makes it clear that, in Aristotle's opinion, the Areopagus not only existed before Solon and before Draco, but that it was even at that time composed of those who had held the office of archon, and that it was in reality the central force in the administration. Its position appears, indeed, to be analogous to that of the senate in the best period of the Roman republic. It represented a governing aristocratical council, electing (as appears from an almost certain restoration of ch. 8, l. 10) the archons, who entered its body after serving their year of office; and its weight, as containing all the official experience of the state, must have given it at least as much influence over the annual magistrates who expected shortly to become members of it as the Roman senate held over the consuls. It seems entirely unnecessary to suppose that there was any other council in existence before the time of Draco. The court of 300 which tried the Alcmeonidae in the case of Cylon was clearly a special court for a special purpose; and the council of the same number which Cleomenes and Isagoras attempted to set up in 508 B.C. was only a revolutionary substitute for the existing council of 400 (or of 500, if the reform of Cleisthenes had already been actually carried out, which seems improbable). At what time the method of recruiting the Areopagus from the ex-archons was adopted, or what was its character before that date, it is impossible to say with certainty; but common sense and analogy make it probable that originally it was a council of elders summoned by the king. It is not impossible that all

τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει, καὶ κολάζουσα καὶ ζημ[ιο]ῦσα πάντας τοὺς ἀκοσμοῦντας κυρίως. ἡ γὰρ αἵρεσις τῶν ἀρχόντων ἀριστίνδην καὶ πλουτίνδην ἦν, ἐξ ὧν οἱ Ἀρεοπαγῖται καθίσταντο. διὸ καὶ μόνη τῶν ἀρχῶν αὕτη μεμένηκε διὰ βίου καὶ νῦν.

4. *Ἡ μὲν οὖν πρώτη πολιτεία ταύτην ε[ἶ]χε τὴν ὑπο[γρα]φήν. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, χρόνου τινὸς οὐ πολλοῦ διελθόντος, ἐπ' Ἀρισταίχμου ἄρχοντος Δρά[κω]ν τοὺς*

44. *καὶ κολάζουσα*: H-L. expunge *καί*, after Gennadios. 45. *κυρίως*: *κυρία ἦν* Kontos.

heads of *γένη* may have had a traditional right to a summons, which would fix the total number at 360; but it is highly improbable that they had any absolute right, as such councils in early times almost always rested on the will of the sovereign. But when the monarchy was abolished there was no individual to whom the duty of nominating the governing council could fitly be entrusted, and the automatic process of forming it from all ex-archons was therefore probably put into operation from the date of the establishment of the annual archonships, though it would of course be many years before the council came to be composed solely of those who had served this office.

IV. 3. *ἐπ' Ἀρισταίχμου ἄρχοντος*: the name is not otherwise known. It is to be observed that Draco was not archon eponymus at the time of his legislative reforms, as has been commonly supposed. The phrase of Pausanias (IX. 36, 8) *Δράκοντος Ἀθηναίοις θεσμοθετήσαντος* may possibly indicate that he was one of the junior archons, though it is not necessary so to interpret the word.

Δράκων τοὺς θεσμοὺς ἔθηκεν: this chapter presents considerable difficulties, on two grounds, (1) the mention of Draco as a constitutional reformer, (2) the details ascribed to his constitution. No other author speaks of Draco except as a jurist, the maker (or codifier) of criminal law; and in *Pol.* II. 12, it is expressly stated that he made no change in the political constitution (*πολιτείᾳ δ' ὑπαρχούσῃ τοὺς νόμους ἔθηκε*). As regards the latter passage, Dr. P. Meyer (*Des Aristoteles Politik und die Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, pp. 31–44), accepting it as genuine, argues that the constitution here ascribed to Draco does not substantially differ from that described in ch. 3, so that Draco actually made no new constitution. He considers the repetition to be intended to prove precisely this point, so that we have here the proof of the statement of the *Politics*. But, on this theory, the meaning is very awkwardly concealed, for certainly there appears on the face of it to be a marked contrast expressed between the *ἀρχαία πολιτεία* and that

θεσμοὺς ἔθηκεν· ἡ δὲ τάξις αὕτη τόνδε τὸν τρόπον εἶχε. 2

4. αὕτη: MS. apparently αυτ', *i.e.* αυτης.

of Draco. The name of Draco is also connected with the second μεταβολή of the constitution in the list in ch. 41; and though Dr. Meyer urges that the constitution in question is only described as '*in the time of* Draco (ἡ ἐπὶ Δράκοντος), he omits to notice that precisely the same phrase is used to describe the constitution of Solon, and the name is clearly given as that of the person responsible for the reforms. Far the simplest explanation is to accept the conclusion which is already held by most students of the *Politics*, that the 12th chapter of the second book is spurious. This removes the contradiction between the Aristotelian writings, though it leaves the difficulty that no other author mentions the reforms of Draco. Probably the name of Solon eclipsed that of his predecessor. The tendency notoriously was to attribute everything to Solon; and as the laws of Draco were all repealed (except those relating to murder), the statutes enacting the institutions (such as the βουλή) which Solon borrowed from his predecessor all ran in the name of Solon. The extension of the franchise to all persons capable of providing a military equipment, which was Draco's principal reform, was quickly swamped in the wider measure of Solon, and dropped out of public knowledge. Plutarch tells us that even the institution of the Areopagus was habitually assigned to Solon; and hence it is less surprising that the name of Draco should have been connected in later times only with that part of his legislation which had actually survived.

As to the details of the Draconian constitution, it is certainly surprising to find so many institutions and offices referred to, which had hitherto been only known to exist at a later date. M. T. Reinach regards the whole chapter as a later interpolation, which also involves the rejection of the words τῆς πρὸ Δράκοντος in ch. 3, l. 1 and the clause referring to Draco in ch. 41, ll. 14, 15. Mr. Macan (*Journ. of Hellenic Studies*, XII. 27) and Mr. J. W. Headlam (*Class. Rev.* V. 166–168) ingeniously suggest that we have here a representation of the constitution which was ascribed to Draco by party politicians at the time of the formation of the constitution of the Four Hundred, which agrees with that here described in several particulars. But even supposing that such a garbled version of the Draconian constitution were in existence, it must have borne some resemblance to the authentic original in order to avoid immediate exposure. Perhaps the objections that have been felt to the details here given arise rather from the novelty of the information than from any intrinsic improbability. The extension of political rights to all men capable of furnishing a military equipment is a very natural transition between the exclusion of all except Eupatrids from political

ἀπεδέδοτο μὲν ἡ πολιτεία τοῖς ὅπλα παρεχομένοις· ᾑροῦντο δὲ τοὺς μὲν ἐννέα ἄρχοντας [καὶ τ]οὺς [τ]αμίας

5. *μέν*: the MS. is not clear, but some letter with a mark of abbreviation precedes *ἡ*. 6. *ἄρχοντας*: MS. *αρχοντες*.

power and the extension of rights to all citizens by Solon. The officials mentioned, strategi, hipparchs, treasurers, prytanes, are all necessary even to this early stage of organisation; and it may be observed that the strategi and hipparchs are treated as exactly on the same level, which would hardly be the case if this were a reflection from the time of the Four Hundred. The provision requiring sureties from retiring magistrates is certainly not borrowed from the constitution of the Four Hundred or any other stage of Athenian history, and therefore has an air of authenticity. There is no intrinsic reason why a *βουλή* should not be instituted by Draco as much as by Solon, and the number of 401 sounds more like a genuine provision than a late invention. The system of fines for non-attendance is certainly old (*cf.* note on l. 22); and the details of that system show that no one below a *ζευγίτης* was a member of the Council or Ecclesia. The chief difficulty is to be found in the respective property qualifications of the archons and strategi, and here there may well be a corruption in the text, numerals being notoriously easily confounded. A full examination of the problems connected with this chapter is not possible within the limits of a note, but a sober historical judgment will probably in the end find its statements not so startling as they at first appear.

It is noticeable that Aristotle says nothing of the legal code which is the best-known work of Draco. No doubt the present treatise is primarily constitutional, not legal, and therefore reforms in judicial procedure and criminal law have no direct place in it; but at the same time it is so far historical that one would have expected some allusion to facts so well known, which have, moreover, some bearing on the transition from the autocratic to the popular method of government at Athens.

5. *ἀπεδέδοτο*: possibly *ἀπεδίδοτο* should be read. The pluperfect would properly mean that the extension of the franchise had taken place earlier; but in that case it would have been mentioned in the preceding description *τῆς πρὸ Δράκοντος πολιτείας*, and the contrast here between what previously existed and what Draco enacted would be more clearly expressed.

τοῖς ὅπλα παρεχομένοις: the same qualification was revived at the deposition of the Four Hundred in 411 B.C., and under this constitution Thucydides (VIII. 97) affirms Athens to have enjoyed the best government within his memory; a favourable judgment which is repeated by Aristotle (*infra*, ch. 33).

οὐσίαν κεκτημένους οὐκ ἐλάττω δέκα μνῶν ἐλευθέραν,
[Col. 2.] *τὰς δ' ἄλλας ἀρχὰς ⟨τὰς⟩ ἐλάττους ἐκ τῶν ὅπλα παρε-*
χ[ομένων], στρατηγοὺς δὲ καὶ ἱππάρχους οὐσίαν ἀπο-
φαίνοντας οὐκ ἔλαττον ἢ ἑκατὸν μνῶν ἐλευθέραν καὶ
παῖδας ἐ[κ] γαμετῆς γυναικὸς γνησίους ὑπὲρ δέκα ἔτη
γεγονότας· τούτους δ' ἔδει διε[γγυ]ᾶ[σθαι] τοὺς πρυ-
τάνεις καὶ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἱππάρχους τοὺς
ἕνους μέχρι εὐθυνῶν, ἐγγυητὰς δ' ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τέλους
δεχομένους οὗπερ οἱ στρατηγοὶ καὶ οἱ ἵππαρχοι. βου- 3
λεύειν δὲ τετρακοσίους καὶ ἕνα τοὺς λαχόντας ἐκ τῆς

7. *ἐλάττω*: K-W. emend *ἔλαττον ἤ*. 8. *τὰς ἐλάττους*: *τάς* is added by Richards, Blass, H-L., K-W. 10. *ἐλευθέραν*: MS. *ελευθερων*. 12. *δ' ἔδει διεγγυᾶσθαι*: MS. *δ' δι* . . . , and over *δι* is written *δει*. H-L. suggest that *δει* is an addition, not a correction, reading *ἔδει διατηρεῖν*: but the letter after *δι* appears to be *ε*, and there seems also to be an *α* later. If *διεγγυᾶσθαι* is right, the termination is contracted. K-W. mark a lacuna.

7. *δέκα μνῶν*: this qualification is absurdly low. As Mr. E. S. Thompson and others have pointed out, a property of ten minas would not even gain admission into the third 'Solonian' class. Mr. Thompson therefore proposes *ἑκατόν*, M. Weil *διακοσίων*, and *τριακοσίων* ($\bar{\tau}$ for $\bar{\iota}$) is also possible. The writing of the MS. in this and the following lines is very faint, but the readings are tolerably certain.

9. *στρατηγούς*: this is the earliest mention of these officers, but their existence is perfectly natural. They were, of course, purely military officials at this date, and the polemarch was their superior and commander-in-chief (ch. 22, l. 11).

12. *τούτους δὲ κ.τ.λ.*: the correct reading of this passage is primarily due to Paton and van Leeuwen (independently), the former conjecturing *τοὺς ἕνους* and *ἐγγυητὰς δ'* (both of which are confirmed by the MS.) and the latter *τοὺς ἕνους* and *ἐπιμελητὰς δ'*. Mr. Paton, however, explained *τούτους* as referring to the *παῖδες*, whereas it appears rather to refer to the *στρατηγοί* and *ἵππαρχοι*. He also read *διαφυλάξαι* above.

15. *βουλεύειν*: this is the first mention of a Council other than the Areopagus, and it was probably created for the first time by Draco. Until the Ecclesia began to have some definite work to do there was no occasion for the *βουλή*, the general supervision of the administration being in the hands of the Areopagus.

16. *τετρακοσίους καὶ ἕνα*: this addition of a single member in order to secure an uneven number in an assembly is paralleled by the *δικαστήρια* of later times, but was not retained by Solon in his reorganisation of

πολιτείας· κληροῦσθαι δὲ καὶ ταύτην καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀρχὰς τοὺς ὑπὲρ τριάκοντα ἔτη γεγονότας, καὶ δὶς τὸν αὐτὸν μὴ ἄρχειν πρὸ τοῦ πάντας [ἐξ]ελθεῖν· τότε δὲ πάλ[ιν] ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς κληροῦν. εἰ δέ τις τῶν βουλευτῶν, ὅταν ἕδρα βουλῆς ἢ ἐκκλησίας ᾖ, ἐκλείποι τὴν σ.ύνο-

18. τριάκοντα: MS. τριακονθ. 19. ἐξελθεῖν: so K-W., H-L.; 1st ed. [περι]ελθεῖν: K-W.[2] [διε]ξελθεῖν, for which there is not room. 21. ἐκλείποι: H-L. emend ἐκλίποι.

the Council. Apparently under the Draconian system the members were selected by lot from the whole body of those possessing the franchise (ἐκ τῆς πολιτείας), in which case the odd number presented no difficulty; whereas the Solonian Council was chosen equally from the four tribes.

17. κληροῦσθαι: this is the first mention of the use of the lot as a method of election. At present it was applied only to the Council and some subordinate magistrates. On the general working of the lot, *cf.* Mr. J. W. Headlam's essay on *Election by lot at Athens* (Cambridge, 1891). It is clear from the provision stated below (καὶ δὶς . . . ἐξελθεῖν) that all qualified persons would be required to serve in their turn, and that the lot merely decided the order in which they took office.

καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀρχάς: this cannot mean that all the magistrates were henceforth elected by lot, as we know that the archons were not so elected till a later period (*cf. infra*, ch. 22), and the same must certainly have been the case with the other more important offices. The passage merely means that the Council and those magistrates who were chosen by lot were chosen from persons of the stated age, *i. e.* over thirty.

18. ὑπὲρ τριάκοντα ἔτη: it is probable that this limit of age continued in force in later times, though it is nowhere directly stated except as regards the members of the Council (Xen. *Mem.* I. 2. 35) and the dicasts (ch. 63, l. 14 of this treatise, Poll. VIII. 122); but these instances in themselves make it probable that the same restriction applied to other magistracies, and the present passage tends to support this view. (*Cf.* Meier, *Att. Proc.* p. 204, Schömann, *Ant. Jur. Pub.* p. 238).

21. ἐκκλησίας: this is the first mention of the existence of this body, and raises the question as to its original character. It has been commonly supposed that it existed from the earliest times, and that it represented the general meetings which we find mentioned in the Homeric poems. It has further been held that it elected the officers of state and was consulted on questions of peace and war, and that reforms in a popular direction, such as the appointments of Draco and Solon to re-model the constitution, were due to its action (*cf.* Abbott, I. 301). As to the

δον, ἀπέτινον ὁ μὲν πεντακοσιομέδιμνος τρεῖς δραχ-

existence of some such body before the time of Draco, it may reasonably be argued that, were it otherwise, the institution of it would probably have been mentioned here, as that of the βουλή is. But it seems certain that it did not exist in any effective shape. The analogy of the English constitution may show that the primitive consultation of the tribal or national assembly may practically disappear, or be represented only by the summoning of a council of nobles, until the people acquires sufficient strength to demand an effective voice in the state. The discontent of the lower orders, necessitating some measure of reform to pacify them, finds its expression in early times in στάσις rather than by constitutional means. It was στάσις, which needed no Ecclesia for its expression, which forced on the reforms of Draco and of Solon. Elections, as we know from ch. 8, were in the hands of the Areopagus. Even in the case of war there is no necessity to suppose the consultation of a popular assembly. The army was formed by contingents from the various tribal divisions, and the domination of the aristocracy was so great as to make it very unlikely that there would be any effective resistance from the people, except when extreme exasperation provoked a στάσις, and then no doubt the inability of the governing class to form an army in the case of a foreign attack or the revolt of a dependency was a powerful inducement to them to come to terms with the lower orders. There may, however, have been some gathering of the people before military service known as an ecclesia, which will account for the omission to notice the creation of such a body by Draco; but it was Draco who took the first step towards making it an important part of the constitution. He made all persons capable of furnishing a military equipment members of it, and to them was apparently committed the election of the officers of state; and though it is not likely that any other business of real importance was delegated to it, and the Areopagus still retained the general direction of affairs, yet the Ecclesia was henceforth an integral portion of the state and capable of the development which was effected by Solon and subsequent statesmen.

22. ἀπέτινον κ.τ.λ.: fines for non-attendance at official duties are characteristic of the earlier part of Athenian history alone, as they naturally cease with the establishment of payment for attendance. As Boeckh (*Staatshaushaltung*, 3rd ed. I. 444, bk. III. ch. 12) shows, in the time of Solon the fines were usually very small; thus a person convicted of using abusive language in public was fined only five drachmas under the laws of Solon, whereas in later times the fine was 500 drachmas. In comparison with this scale a fine of one to three drachmas for missing a meeting of the Council or Assembly appears high.

πεντακοσιομέδιμνος κ.τ.λ.: the mention of these property classes

4 *μάς, ὁ [δὲ ἱ]ππεὺς δύο, ζευγίτης δὲ μίαν. ἡ δὲ βουλὴ*
ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου φύλαξ ἦν τῶν νόμων καὶ διετήρ[ει
τὰ]ς ἀρχὰς ὅπως κατὰ τοὺς νόμους ἄρχωσιν. ἐξῆν δὲ
τῷ ἀδικουμένῳ πρὸ[ς τὴν τῶν] Ἀρεοπαγιτ[ῶν] βου-
λὴν εἰσαγγέλλειν ἀποφαίνοντι παρ' ὃν ἀδικεῖται
5 *νόμον. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς σώ[μα]σιν ἦσαν δεδεμένοι,*
καθάπερ εἴρηται, καὶ ἡ χώρα δι' ὀλίγων ἦν.

5. *Τοιαύτης δὲ τῆς τάξεως οὔσης ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ*
καὶ τῶν [π]ολλῶν δουλευόντων τοῖς ὀλίγοις, ἀντέστη
2 *τοῖς γνωρίμοις ὁ δῆμος. ἰσχυρᾶς δὲ τῆς στάσεως*
οὔσης καὶ πολ[ὺν] χρόνον ἀντικαθημένων ἀλλήλοις,
εἵλοντο κοινῇ διαλλακτὴν καὶ ἄρχοντα Σόλωνα, καὶ

23. *ζευγίτης*: K-W. and H-L. prefix ⟨ὁ⟩. Palaeographically the supplement is easy, but the position of *δέ* is against it. 26. *Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν* : MS. *αρεοπαγειτων*. 28. *δεδεμένοι* : Richards and H-L. *δεδανεισμένοι*. The MS. is somewhat doubtful.

before the time of Solon is surprising; *cf.* note on ch. 7, l. 10. That a system of property qualification existed even previously to Draco is shown by the use of the word *πλουτίνδην* in ch. 3, l. 3.

28. *ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς σώμασιν ἦσαν δεδεμένοι* : in this fact lies the explanation of the failure of Draco's legislation to remove the distress existing in Attica. Though a large class of persons who had hitherto had no part in the state were now admitted to a share in elections and a chance of service in certain posts, yet the labouring class were in no way touched by this reform, and their economical condition was in no way improved. It was not until Solon had relieved them of their pecuniary burdens, and had admitted them to at least a slight control over the administration, till Cleisthenes and the reformers of the first half of the fifth century had made that control effective, till pay was given for public service, and the large increase of the slave class had relieved them of the greater part of the manual labour necessary in the country, that the democracy could become fully established. In the time of Draco, however, most of these changes would have been premature and impracticable; but one evil did call emphatically for remedy, namely the economical condition of the labouring class, and it was this which made the legislation of Solon necessary within a few years of the reforms of Draco.

τ[ὴν πολι]τεί[α]ν ἐπέτρεψαν αὐτῷ ποιήσαντι τὴν ἐλεγείαν ἧς ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ

Γινώ[σκω], καί μοι φρενὸς ἔνδοθεν ἄλγεα κεῖται,
πρεσβυτάτην ἐσορῶν γαῖαν Ἰαονίας.

καὶ γὰρ ἐπελαύνει καὶ πρὸς ἑκατέρους ὑπὲρ ἑκατέρων μάχεται καὶ διαμφισβητεῖ, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα κοινῇ παραινεῖ [κατα]παύειν τὴν ἐνεστῶσαν φιλονικίαν. ἦν δ' ὁ Σόλων τῇ μὲν [φύ]σει καὶ τῇ δόξῃ τῶν πρώτων, τῇ δ' οὐσίᾳ καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι τῶν μέσων, ὡς ἔκ τε τῶν ἄλλων ὁμολογεῖται καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖσδε τοῖς ποιήμασιν μαρτυρεῖ, παραινῶν τοῖς πλουσίοις μὴ πλεονεκτεῖν·

V. 10. γὰρ ἐπελαύνει καί: the reading is very doubtful; MS. apparently επελαυνεν. J, B. Mayor and Richards propose γὰρ ἐπαλλάττει, K-W. γὰρ πολι[τικώτατα], H-L. [συμβουλεύων πολλά]. 12. φιλονικίαν: so corrected in MS. from φιλοτιμιαν. 13. φύσει: first ed. ῥήσει; the fragment of papyrus containing the first letters of this word has been lost in mounting, so it is now impossible to verify the reading. φύσει Richards, Wyse, Blass, K-W., H-L.

V. 6. ποιήσαντι τὴν ἐλεγείαν: in this part of his work Aristotle has preserved considerable fragments of the poetry of Solon. Many of them are already known through having been transferred by Plutarch to his life of Solon and through quotations in other authors. The couplet given here is, however, an addition to the remains previously extant. It appears to belong to the poem on the state of Athens of which a considerable portion is quoted by Demosthenes, *de Fals. Leg.* § 255, pp. 421–3 (Bergk, *Frag.* 4). As there quoted, the beginning is clearly wanting. It may be noticed that the manner in which Aristotle tells the story seems to indicate that this political poem of Solon was the direct cause of his nomination as διαλλακτής, which may be so far true that the publication of it may have called attention to his patriotism and political moderation at the critical moment; but he was of course already a well-known citizen (*cf. infra*, τῇ δόξῃ τῶν πρώτων).

14. πράγμασι: *i. e.* 'position in life,' not 'ability in affairs.'

τῶν μέσων: *cf. Pol.* VI. (IV.) 11, 1296ª 19, Σόλων τε γὰρ ἦν τούτων (*sc.* τῶν μέσων πολιτῶν), δηλοῖ δ' ἐκ τῆς ποιήσεως. The poetry of which Aristotle was thinking is here quoted.

Ὑμεῖς δ' ἡσυχάσαντες ἐνὶ φρεσὶ καρτερὸν ἦτορ,
οἳ πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐς κόρον [ἠλ]άσατε,
ἐν μετρίοισι τ[ρέφεσθ]ε μέγαν νόον· οὔτε γὰρ ἡμεῖς
πεισόμεθ', οὔθ' ὑμῖν ἄρτια τα[ῦτ'] ἔσεται.

καὶ ὅλως αἰεὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς στάσεως ἀνάπτει τοῖς πλουσίοις· διὸ καὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ἐλεγείας δεδοικέναι φησὶ τήν τε φ[ιλαργυρ]ίαν τήν τε ὑπερηφανίαν, ὡς διὰ ταῦτα τῆς ἔχθρας ἐνεστώ[σ]ης.

6. Κύριος δὲ γενόμενος τῶν πραγμ[άτ]ων Σόλων τόν τε δῆμον ἠλευθέρωσε καὶ ἐν τῷ παρόντι καὶ εἰς τὸ μέλλον, κωλύσας δ[ανεί]ζειν ἐπὶ τοῖς σώμασιν, καὶ νόμους ἔθηκε καὶ χρεῶν ἀ[πο]κοπὰς ἐπ[ο]ίησε καὶ τῶν ἰδίων καὶ τῶν δημοσίων, ἃς σεισάχθειαν καλοῦ-

19. *ἠλάσατε*: so Postgate, quoting Tyrtaeus 11, 10, followed by K-W. and H-L. 20. *τρέφεσθε* : H-L. *τ[ίθεσ]θε*, following Platt. 21. *ἄρτια* : H-L. *ἄρκια*, following Kontos. *ταῦτ'*: so H-L., Kontos; K-W. *πά[ντ']*, but MS. seems certainly to have *τα . .* First ed. *τἄ[λλ']*. VI. 1. *Σόλων* : K-W. prefix ⟨*ὁ*⟩. 4. *καὶ νόμους ἔθηκε*: bracketed as an interpolation by K-W., Reinach. 5. *ἃς σεισάχθειαν*: MS. originally *ασεισαχθια*, but the *ς* of *ἅς* has been added above the line. Wessely, however, considers the addition to be merely a rough breathing to *α*.

24. *τήν . . . ὑπερηφανίαν* : it should be hardly necessary to point out that this is a line quoted from Solon. Prof. J. E. B. Mayor proposes *φιλοχρηματίαν* for *φιλαργυρίαν*, from Plut. Sol. 14, *ὀκνῶν φησὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἅψασθαι τῆς πολιτείας καὶ δεδοικὼς τῶν μὲν τὴν φιλοχρηματίαν τῶν δὲ τὴν ὑπερηφανίαν*. But the double *τε* would hardly have been inserted unless it occurred in the verse itself.

VI. 5. *σεισάχθειαν* : Aristotle does not say much about this measure, which was not constitutional but economical in its character. If, however, any doubt remained as to whether it amounted to a clean sweep of all debts, Aristotle's express definition of it as *χρεῶν ἀποκοπαί* should remove it, in spite of the opposite statement of Androtion (fr. 40, *ap.* Plut. *Sol.* c. 15), which limits it to a restriction of the rate of interest and connects it with the alteration of the currency, whereby debtors were allowed to pay their debts in the new and less valuable currency. It would even appear that it extended beyond debts secured on the land, since no limitation is expressed and public debts as well as private were included. It is hardly likely that debts to

σιν, ὡς ἀποσεισάμενοι τὸ βάρος. ἐν οἷς πειρῶνταί
τι[νες] διαβάλλειν αὐτόν· συνέβη γὰρ τῷ Σόλωνι 2
μέλλοντι ποιεῖν τὴν σεισάχ[θ]ειαν προειπεῖν τισὶ
τῶν [γνω]ρίμω[ν], ἔπειθ', ὡς μὲν οἱ δημοτικοὶ λέγουσι,
παραστρατηγηθῆναι διὰ τῶν φίλων, ὡς δ' οἱ [βουλ]ό-
μενοι βλασφημεῖν, καὶ αὐτὸν κοινωνεῖν. δανεισάμενοι
γὰρ οὗτοι συνεπρίαντο πολλὴν χώραν, [μετὰ δ'] οὐ
πολὺ τῆς τῶν χρεῶν ἀποκοπῆς γενομένης ἐπλούτουν·
ὅθεν φασὶ γενέσθαι τοὺς ὕστερον δο[κο]ῦντας εἶναι
παλαιοπλούτους. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ πιθ[ανώ]τερος [ὁ] τῶν 3
δημοτικῶ[ν λ]όγος· οὐ γὰρ [εἰκ]ὸς ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις
οὕτω μέτριον γενέσθαι καὶ κοινὸν [ὥσ]τ', ἐξὸν

6. *ἀποσεισάμενοι*: MS. *αποσισαμενοι*. *ἀποσεισαμένων* J. B. Mayor, K-W. *βάρος*: H-L. [*ἄχθ*]*ος*, but the MS. is clear. 7. *τινες*: so Wyse, K-W., H-L., *etc.*; first ed. *τι* [*καί*]. 10. *διά*: K-W. *ὑπό*, but the MS. is clear. *βουλόμενοι*: this supplement is due to Prof. J. E. B. Mayor and others, 11. *δανεισάμενοι*: MS. *δανισαμενοι*. 12. *μετὰ δ'*: H-L. *εἶτα μετ'*. 13. *γενομένης*: so K-W., H-L.; MS. and first ed. *γινομένης*. 17. *ὥστ'*: this supplement is due to Dr. Jackson and others.

the state were secured by mortgage, since payment of such liabilities can seldom be deferred or allowed to fall into arrears. Probably, in dealing with the large number of obligations secured on the person or land of the debtor, Solon found it impossible to avoid touching the remaining class of debts, and was unable to annul the one without also annulling the other. As the usual security was evidently real property, it is probable that the amount of debts otherwise secured was comparatively small, so that the extension of the *χρεῶν ἀποκοπή* to all debts alike effected a great simplification of the measure without any considerable increase of hardship. In short, Solon's economical reform was a complete measure of *novae tabulae*.

7. *συνέβη γὰρ κ.τ.λ.*: this story of the profit made by the friends of Solon out of the *σεισάχθεια* is also given by Plutarch, *c.* 15. Aristotle does not mention the circumstance which Plutarch adduces as having proved Solon's innocence of complicity in the transaction, *viz.* that he was himself a creditor to the extent of five talents, which he lost by his own measure. He rests his justification of Solon on his general character as proved by his whole career, especially his consistent refusal of the chance of making himself tyrant; this is a fact beyond question, while the story of the five talents may be apocryphal.

αὐτῷ [τ]οὺς [νόμ]ους ὑποποιησάμενον τυραννεῖν τῆς πόλεως, ἀμφοτέροις ἀπεχ[θ]έσθαι καὶ περὶ πλείονος [ποι]ήσασθαι τ[ὸ κα]λὸν καὶ τὴν τῆς πόλεως σωτηρίαν ἢ τὴν αὑτοῦ πλεονεξίαν, ἐν [οὕτ]ω δὲ μικροῖς [καὶ]
4 *ἀν[αξίο]ις καταρρυπαίν[ε]ιν ἑαυτόν. ὅτι δὲ ταύτην ἔσχε τὴν ἐξουσίαν, τά τε πράγματα νοσοῦντα μαρτυρεῖ . . . . . καὶ ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασιν αὐτὸς πολλαχοῦ μέμνηται καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι συνομολογοῦσι πάν[τες]. ταύτην μὲν οὖν χρὴ νομίζειν ψευδῆ τὴν αἰτίαν εἶναι.*

7. *Πολιτείαν δὲ κατέστησε καὶ νόμους ἔθηκεν ἄλλους, τοῖς δὲ Δράκοντος θεσμοῖς ἐπαύσαντο χρώμενοι πλὴν τῶν φονικῶν. ἀναγράψαντες δὲ τοὺς νόμους εἰς τοὺς κύρβεις ἔστησαν ἐν τῇ στοᾷ τῇ βασιλείῳ καὶ ὤμοσαν χρήσεσθαι πάντες· οἱ δ' ἐννέα ἄρχοντες ὀμνύντες πρὸς τῷ λίθῳ κατεφάτιζον ἀναθήσειν ἀνδριάντα χρυσοῦν ἐάν τινα παραβῶσι τῶν*
2 *νόμων· ὅθεν ἔτι καὶ νῦν οὕτως ὀμνύουσι. κατεκύρωσεν δὲ τοὺς νόμους εἰς ἑκατὸν [ἔ]τη καὶ διέταξε τὴν πολι-*

18. *νόμους*: H-L. [*ἑτέρ*]*ους*, after Blass, who compares 11, l. 16. 22. *καταρρυπαίνειν*: MS. *ρυπαινειν*, with *κατα* added above the line. 23. *μαρτυρεῖ*: the decipherment is due to Wessely and Blass. MS. at first *μαρτυρο*, but *ει* is written above the line. The following word is doubtful, but apparently ends in *-το*. Sandys, K-W.[2] suggest *τοῦτο*, Wessely *ἃ ἰάσατο*, but neither seems satisfactory. *μετεχειρίσατο* H-L. (after an earlier suggestion of Sandys), but this is certainly not the word in the MS.

VII. 3. *ἀναγράψαντες δὲ . . . τῇ βασιλείῳ*: this is the first passage (out of very many) which directly proves the present treatise to be Aristotle's *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*, these words being given by Harpocration (*s. v. κύρβεις*) as a quotation from that work. Plutarch also (*Sol.* 25) and the scholiast on Aristophanes' *Birds* 1354 refer to Aristotle for the word *κύρβεις* (*cf.* Rose, *Frag.* 352).

6. *ὀμνύντες κ.τ.λ.*: Plutarch (*l. c.*) paraphrases this passage, *ὤμνυεν . . . ἕκαστος τῶν θεσμοθετῶν ἐν ἀγορᾷ πρὸς τῷ λίθῳ, καταφατίζων, εἴ τι παραβαίη τῶν θεσμῶν, ἀνδριάντα χρυσοῦν ἰσομέτρητον ἀναθήσειν ἐν Δελφοῖς.*

τείαν τόνδε ⟨τὸν⟩ τρόπον. τιμήμα[τα δι]εῖλεν εἰς τέτ- 3
ταρα τέλη, καθάπερ διῄρητο καὶ πρότερον, εἰς πεντα-
κοσιομ[έδιμ]ν[ον καὶ ἱππέα] καὶ ζευγίτην καὶ θῆτα. τὰς

VII. 10. *τόνδε ⟨τὸν⟩ τρόπον*: *τόνδε τρόπον* occurs no less than three times in the present MS., here and in 29, l. 36; 37, l. 5. In face of such repetition it is a strong measure to correct the MS. to the common usage, but the correction is made in deference to the opinion of Blass, K-W., H-L., and others. *τοῦτον τρόπον* (12, l. 1) is not on the same footing, as the omission of the article there admits of a simple palaeographical explanation. *τιμήματα*: K-W. mark a lacuna, 'velut ⟨*τὸ πᾶν πλῆθος ἐκ*⟩ *τιμημάτων*,' which is hardly convincing. H-L. prefix *τά*, after Gennadios.

10. *τιμήματα κ.τ.λ.*: the question raised by the present passage is a difficult one. Hitherto there has been no manner of doubt that the well-known property qualification described in it was established by Solon. Harpocration (*s. v. ἱππάς*) quotes the present work thus, *Ἀριστοτέλης δ' ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ φησὶν ὅτι Σόλων εἰς τέτταρα διεῖλε τέλη τὸ πᾶν πλῆθος Ἀθηναίων, πεντακοσιομεδίμνους καὶ ἱππέας καὶ ζευγίτας καὶ θῆτας*, and again (*s. v. πεντακοσιομέδιμνον*), *ὅτι δ̄ τέλη ἐποίησεν Ἀθηναίων ἁπάντων Σόλων . . . δεδήλωκεν Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ* (Rose, *Frag.* 350). Plutarch (*Sol.* 18) ascribes the system expressly to Solon. In the second book of the *Politics* (*c.* 12) Solon is mentioned in connection with the four property classes, but it is not definitely asserted that he was the originator of them. If the present passage stood alone, one would be strongly inclined to suppose the words *καθάπερ διῄρητο καὶ πρότερον* to be an interpolation; but it is supported by the statement above (ch. 4) that the members of the first three classes incurred certain fines for non-attendance to political duties under the Draconian constitution, and that passage it seems impossible to explain except on the supposition of the existence of these classes before the time of Solon. The statements of Aristotle here can only be reconciled with the general ascription of the classes in question to Solon, by supposing that the latter brought them into a relation with the political constitution which they had never held before. In the first place it may be noticed that Solon began his reforms by repealing *all* of Draco's laws except those relating to murder. This includes the laws settling the political constitution, and as no written laws existed previous to those of Draco, it means that Solon made a clean sweep of all the laws relating to the constitution, so as to have a free hand in re-constructing it according to his own ideas. He then re-introduced the property classes, as well as the Council of Four Hundred and the Areopagus; and thus the earliest laws which were known in later times in Athens establishing these parts of the constitution were those of Solon. The period between Solon and Draco was short, and it is not surprising that all memory of the pre-existence of the two first-named

μ[ὲν οὖ]ν ἀρχὰς ἀπένειμεν ἄρχειν ἐκ πεντακοσιομε- [Col. 3.]

items should have been lost, in face of the fact that the existing laws on which they rested were laws of Solon. The Areopagus dated too far back and had held too large a place in the early history of Athens to share the same fate entirely; yet even in its case an error of the same kind was propagated, and in the time of Plutarch it was the belief of the majority that it too had been created by Solon, a belief which he refutes on sufficient evidence (*Sol.* 19) and which was certainly erroneous. In addition to this, Solon made the property qualification more directly a part of the constitution than it was before; for whereas under Draco's laws the definition of a person having a right to some share in the franchise was that he was τῶν ὅπλα παρεχομένων, in the Solonian constitution it was that he was a member of one or other of the four classes. A property qualification was not unknown in Athens before both Solon and Draco, as is shown by the use of πλουτίνδην in ch. 3, l. 3; but this probably meant nothing but the affixing of a certain income to certain specified offices, and not necessarily a classification of the whole people on a property qualification for political purposes. The mention of it above in the constitution of Draco speaks of it as used for differentiating the amounts of the fines due for neglect of public duties, and it may reasonably be supposed to have been employed for purposes of taxation as well; but Solon was probably the first to employ this classification as a basis for the political organisation of the state. Before his time none but the members of the old Eupatrid aristocracy had any important share in the government; and hence Solon was rightly regarded in after times as the reformer who substituted the qualification of property for the qualification of birth, while the fact that the property classification had existed previously for other purposes was forgotten. The only real difficulty arises from the direct citation of Aristotle by Harpocration, and this may be due to careless or second-hand quotation. It is also possible (though hardly probable) that the words καθάπερ διῄρητο καὶ πρότερον may be an interpolation due to some one who noticed the mention of the property classes in the description of the Draconian constitution, so that, while the fact of the pre-existence remains the same, the mention of it in this particular sentence would disappear. This would relieve Harpocration from the charge of inaccurate or garbled quotation; but in view of the fact that the MS. is certainly much earlier than the date of Harpocration this does not seem to be a very safe explanation.

13. ἀπένειμεν ἄρχειν: the latter part of this sentence explains the first. It does not mean that members of the first three classes were eligible to all the offices named, as is clear from the statement a little lower down that the ταμίαι were elected from the first class alone, which it is practically certain was also the case with the archons (*cf.* Plutarch,

δίμνων καὶ ἱππέων καὶ ζευγιτῶν, τοὺς ἐννέα ἄρχον-
τας καὶ τοὺς ταμίας καὶ τοὺς πωλη[τὰς] καὶ τοὺς
ἕνδεκα καὶ τοὺς κωλακρέτας, ἑκάστοις ἀνάλογον τῷ
μεγέθει τοῦ τιμ[ή]μ[ατο]ς ἀποδιδοὺς τ[ὴν ἀρ]χήν.
τοῖς δὲ τὸ θητικὸν τελοῦσιν ἐκκλησίας καὶ δικασ-
τηρίων μετέδωκε μόνον. ἔδει δὲ τελεῖν πεντακοσιομέ- 4
διμνον μὲν ὃς ἂν ἐκ τῆς οἰκείας ποιῇ πεντακόσια
μέτρα τὰ συνάμφω ξηρὰ καὶ ὑγρά, ἱππάδα δὲ τοὺς
τριακόσια ποιοῦντας, ὡς δ' ἔνιοί φασι τοὺς ἱπποτρο-
φεῖν δυναμένους. σημεῖον δὲ φέρουσι τό τε ὄνομα
το[ῦ] τέλους, ὡς ἂν ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγ[μ]ατος κείμενον,
καὶ τὰ ἀναθήματα τῶν ἀρχαίων· ἀνάκειται γὰρ ἐν
ἀκροπόλει εἰκὼν Διφίλου ἐ[φ' ᾗ ἐπ]ιγέγραπται τάδε·

20. τῆς: γῆς Bywater, but Kontos (*Athena* III. 321, 322) gives many instances which support the MS. reading. 21. ξηρὰ καὶ ὑγρά: H-L. ξηρῶν καὶ ὑγρῶν, from Plut. *Sol.* 18, which, however, has ἐν with dat. 23. δὲ φέρουσι: H-L. δ' ἐπιφέρουσι, from ch. 3, l. 13. 24. ὡς ἂν . . . κείμενον: H-L. omit as an interpolation.

Arist. 1). The offices mentioned were filled from the first three classes, but some of them were filled from one class and others from another, ἑκάστοις ἀνάλογον τῷ μεγέθει τοῦ τιμήματος ἀποδιδοὺς τὴν ἀρχήν. The highest offices were open to the first class alone, the lower to the others as well.

18. **τοῖς δὲ τὸ θητικὸν τελοῦσιν ἐκκλησίας καὶ δικαστηρίων μετέδωκε μόνον**: this corresponds with the ἀναγκαιοτάτη δύναμις which Solon is said in *Pol.* II. 12 to have given to the lowest class, τὸ τὰς ἀρχὰς αἱρεῖσθαι καὶ εὐθύνειν. This was the most distinctively democratic innovation introduced by Solon, and in virtue of it he was rightly regarded in subsequent times as the founder of the democracy of Athens. He was not the first to shake the ascendancy of the Eupatrid oligarchy. That was the work of Draco; but Solon was the first to remove all considerations of birth from the political constitution, and to give the labouring classes a share in political power.

22. **ὡς δ' ἔνιοί φασι**: no doubt the two standards are really the same. An income of 300 medimni was fixed as representing that on which a man could furnish himself with the equipment of a mounted soldier.

26. **εἰκὼν Διφίλου**: Mr. A. S. Murray has pointed out that this must be a mistake, either of the author or of the copyist, for, as appears from

Διφίλου Ἀνθεμίων τήνδ' ἀνέθηκε θεοῖς,
θητικοῦ ἀντὶ τέλους ἱππάδ' ἀμειψάμενος.

καὶ παρέστηκεν ἵππος ἐκμαρτυρῶν ὡς τὴν ἱππάδα τοῦτο σημα[ί]νουσ[α]ν. οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' εὐλογώτερον τοῖς μέτροις διῃρῆσθαι καθάπερ τοὺς πεντακοσιομεδίμνους. ζευγίσιον δὲ τελεῖν τοὺς διακόσια τὰ συνάμφω ποιοῦντας· τοὺς δ' ἄλλους θητικόν, οὐδεμιᾶς μετέχοντας ἀρχῆς. διὸ καὶ νῦν ἐπειδὰν ἔρηται

29. ἐκμαρτυρῶν : H-L. ἐπιμαρτυρῶν, after Blass (who also conj. ἐκ τῶν ἀριστέρων); K-W. obelize the word. 31. μέτροις : MS. μετρίοις. 32. δέ : H-L. δ' ἔδει, after Kontos.

the inscription, Diphilus belonged to the class of Thetes and consequently could not properly have been represented with a horse. The statue must have been of the son, Anthemion. This statue is also referred to, and the inscription upon it quoted, by Pollux (VIII. 131). The MSS. of the latter give the first line as Διφίλου Ἀνθεμίων ἵππον τόνδ' ἀνέθηκε θεοῖς, excepting one which agrees with the present text with merely the substitution of τόνδ' for τήνδ'. The editors and commentators have either taken the name Διφίλου out of the line, attaching it to the word ἐπίγραμμα which precedes it, or else have emended it into a hexameter, Διφίλου Ἀνθεμίων τόνδ' ἵππον θεοῖς ἀνέθηκε. The present text probably gives the real reading of the inscription, as two pentameters, the corruption of most of the MSS. of Pollux being explained by the intrusion into the line of the gloss ἵππον. Many reconstructions of the line as a hexameter have recently been offered, but none of them explains the corruption.

32. διακόσια: this confirms the usual statement as to the property qualification of the Ζευγῖται, as against Boeckh (*Staatsh.*, 3rd ed. I. 581, bk. IV. 5), who holds it to have been 150 medimni, on the strength of a law quoted by Demosthenes (*Contr. Macart.* § 54, pp. 1067, 1068), in which the dowry which a man of one of the three upper classes was bound to give to a relative in the lowest who was heiress to her deceased father (ἐπίκληρος) was fixed, if he was a pentacosiomedimnus at 500 drachmas, if he was a knight at 300 drachmas (in each case the equivalent of a minimum year's income for the class), and if he was a zeugites at 150 drachmas, which Boeckh argues must equally represent the minimum income (a medimnus being valued at a drachma in Solon's system) of the third class. But this is too slight a basis on which to construct a refutation of all the ancient writers who mention the subject, to whom is now added the great authority of Aristotle.

34. διὸ καὶ νῦν κ.τ.λ.: this is interesting, as showing that the property

3 τὸν μέλλοντα κληροῦσθαί τιν' ἀρχὴν ποῖον τέλος τελεῖ, οὐδ' ἂν εἷς εἴποι θητικόν.

8. Τὰς δ' ἀρχὰς ἐποίησε κληρωτὰς ἐκ προκρίτων,

VIII. 1. τὰς δ' ἀρχάς: MS. τ' δ αρχης.

qualification can never have been entirely abolished by law. The date of the final extension of eligibility to the archonship belongs to the period between the Persian and Peloponnesian wars, the Ζευγῖται being made eligible in 457 B.C. (see ch. 26, l. 17 and note). Whether there was any partial extension previously to this there is no evidence to show; but the final extension can only have taken the form of throwing open the office to all possessed of the lowest qualification, that of a Ζευγίτης, while by a legal fiction even a person who did not come up to that standard was allowed to represent himself as possessing the required qualification. A partial parallel may be found in the notorious evasion of the law of property qualification for a member of the English parliament previous to 1858.

VIII. 1. κληρωτὰς ἐκ προκρίτων: this passage is at variance with the ordinary belief as to the manner of election to the archonship in the sixth century. It has been supposed, as common sense suggested in the absence of direct evidence, that until the lot was introduced about the time of the Persian wars the archons were directly elected, whether by the people or in whatever manner prevailed in earlier times. It is now certain (*cf. infra*, l. 10) that in early times (presumably until the constitution of Draco, by whom the election was apparently given to the ecclesia) the archons were directly elected to their offices by the Areopagus; but that when Solon introduced the people to political power a combined process of selection and sortition was devised. The four tribes elected ten candidates each, and from the forty persons thus designated the nine required officers were chosen by lot. With this passage may be compared the statement in [Demosth.] *contr. Neaer.* § 75, p. 1370, τὸν μὲν βασιλέα ... ὁ δῆμος ᾑρεῖτο ἐκ προκρίτων κατ' ἀνδραγαθίαν χειροτονῶν. The author of the speech refers this system to the time of Theseus, which is plainly impossible; but it may be a recollection of the state of things under the Solonian constitution. The only discrepancy with the passage of Aristotle lies in the word χειροτονῶν: for whereas Aristotle represents the second stage of the election as conducted by the lot, the orator regards both processes as selective. On *a priori* grounds the latter version would be preferable, and it accords with the general view that the lot was not introduced for any purpose before the time of Cleisthenes at the earliest. On the other hand the orators, who are notoriously inaccurate in their history, are not to be compared with Aristotle as an authority, especially as the latter quotes a proof of his statement from the practice of his own day. Isocrates has a

[ο]ὓς [ἑκάσ]τη προκρίνειε τῶν φυλῶν. προὔκρινεν δ' εἰς τοὺς ἐννέα ἄρχοντας ἑκάστη δέκα, καὶ τού[τοις] ἐ[πεκ]λήρουν· ὅθεν ἔτι διαμένει ταῖς φυλαῖς τὸ δέκα κληροῦν ἑκάστην, εἶτ' ἐκ τούτων κυαμεύε[ιν]. σημεῖον

2. *προκρίνειε*: so K-W. following Gertz; MS. and 1st ed. *προκρίνει*, H-L. (after Blass) *προὔκρινε*. 3. *τούτοις ἐπεκλήρουν* : there is only room for one letter between *του* and *ε*, but something has been written above the line, and it looks as if the scribe had written *τους* and corrected it to *τουτοις*. 1st ed. *τούτους ἐκλήρουν*, which H-L. accept. K-W. ⟨*ἐκ*⟩ *τού*[*των ἐκλ*]*ήρουν* (K-W^2. omit *ἐκ*), Gomperz *κἀκ* for *καί*.

passage on the subject (*Areop. c.* 22, p. 144), *οὐκ ἐξ ἁπάντων τὰς ἀρχὰς κληροῦντες, ἀλλὰ τοὺς βελτίστους καὶ τοὺς ἱκανωτάτους ἐφ' ἕκαστον τῶν ἔργων προκρίνοντες*, but he makes no clear distinction between the constitutions of Solon and of Cleisthenes, and is too vague to be of much use in an argument. He is clearer in *Panath.* § 145, p. 263 (cited by Mr. W. L. Newman, *Class. Rev.* V. 161), *περὶ δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους καθίστασαν ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς τοὺς προκριθέντας ὑπὸ τῶν φυλετῶν καὶ δημοτῶν*, but the reference to the *δημόται* is probably inexact. In any case the Solonian system was not of long duration; for even in the years which intervened between its establishment and its abrogation by the tyranny of Pisistratus we find that there were several disturbances to the normal process of election. On the changes subsequently introduced, see below, ch. 22, l. 27, and note.

It must be observed that the present passage, in ascribing this system of election to Solon, is not consistent with the statement in the *Politics* (II. 12) that Solon made no change in the election of magistrates. This however is not the first contradiction that we have found between that chapter and this treatise, and it has already been noticed that the chapter in the *Politics* is of doubtful authenticity (*cf.* note on ch. 4, l. 3).

3. *τούτοις ἐπεκλήρουν* : if this reading is right (and it does not seem possible to make anything else of the MS.) *τὰς ἀρχάς* must be supplied to complete the sense. The meaning evidently is that they cast the lot among the forty selected candidates to determine which should serve as archons; but the expression is not satisfactory. In ch. 59, l. 19 occurs the phrase *ἐπικληροῦσι ταῖς ἀρχαῖς τὰ δικαστήρια*, which is partly parallel.

5. *κληροῦν . . . κυαμεύειν* : there is no difference in meaning between these words, both being regularly used of election by lot, as opposed to *χειροτονεῖν* or *αἱρεῖσθαι*. The difference between the earlier and the later practice was that at first the tribes elected their ten candidates apiece by deliberate choice, and the lot was only put into operation between the forty individuals thus nominated; whereas afterwards the lot was employed in both stages of the election.

ταῦτα περιελαυνόμενος ὁ Μεγακλῆς τῇ στάσει,

V. 12 that he was in possession of the tyranny for *seventeen* years out of thirty-three; and the details which are given in the present narrative fail to clear up the obscurity, which may, however, be partly accounted for by different reckonings of the odd fractions of years. He tells us that the first expulsion took place ἕκτῳ ἔτει, or five full years after the first establishment of the tyranny; that the return and establishment of the second tyranny occurred δωδεκάτῳ ἔτει μετὰ ταῦτα, that the second expulsion took place ἔτει μάλιστα ἑβδόμῳ μετὰ τὴν κάθοδον, and the final return ἑνδεκάτῳ ἔτει. These periods, added together, amount at the lowest computation to thirty-two years, leaving only one for the third tyranny, which it is clear from all the accounts was the longest; moreover, the two periods of exile amount to twenty-one years instead of the fourteen which Aristotle assigns to them in his summary of Pisistratus' career. Bauer and others, to avoid this difficulty, calculate the ἔτος δωδέκατον from the commencement of the first tyranny; but this is contrary to the usage of the present treatise, in which μετὰ ταῦτα always refers to the last fixed chronological point, which in this case is the archonship of Hegesias. Moreover, this calculation gives sixteen years of exile in all, instead of fourteen. It is certain, then, that there is a mistake somewhere, and the most probable place is the first period of exile. It is not spoken of, either by Herodotus or by Aristotle, as if it were so important as the second period, and no account is given of the movements of Pisistratus in the course of it. Taking ten years as the duration of the second exile, on which point Herodotus and Aristotle agree, four years are left for the first exile; and if the durations of the first and second tyrannies are correct we get the following chronology of the career of Pisistratus after his accession to power. First tyranny, 560–555 B.C.; first exile, 555–551 B.C.; second tyranny, 551–545 B.C.; second exile, 545–535 B.C.; third tyranny, 535–527 B.C. As Aristotle is uncertain as to the exact length of the second tyranny, it is possible that its duration should be slightly curtailed, and the third correspondingly increased. It has hitherto been generally supposed that the final term of rule was longer in proportion to the other two than is here represented; but no other arrangement seems possible without considerable violence to the text of Aristotle. Moreover eight or nine years are enough to prove the complete establishment of the despotism, and if we suppose the first and second periods to have been more or less disturbed by threatened attacks from Lycurgus and Megacles and their followers, whereas in the third Pisistratus was unassailed and was able at the end of it to hand his power on to his sons without question, a sufficient difference between it and the earlier periods is indicated to account for the way in which Herodotus and Aristotle speak of it.

πάλιν ἐπικηρυκευσάμενος πρὸς [τὸ]ν Πεισίστρατον ἐφ' ᾧ τε τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ λήψεται, κατήγαγεν αὐτὸν ἀρχαϊκῶς καὶ λίαν ἁπλῶς. προδιασπείρας γὰρ λόγον ὡς τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς καταγούσης Πεισίστρατον, καὶ γυναῖκα μεγάλην καὶ καλὴν ἐξευρών, ὡς μὲν Ἡρόδοτός φησιν ἐκ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Παιανιέων, ὡς δ' ἔνιοι λέγουσιν ἐκ τοῦ Κολλυτοῦ στεφανόπωλιν Θρᾷτταν, ᾗ ὄνομα Φύη, τὴν θεὸν ἀπομιμησάμενος τῷ κόσμῳ συν[εισή]γαγε[ν] μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ μὲν Πεισίστρατος ἐφ' ἅρματος εἰσήλαυνε παραιβατούσης τῆς γυναικός, οἱ δ' ἐν τῷ ἄστει προσκυνοῦντες ἐδέχοντο θαυμάζοντες.

15. Ἡ μὲν οὖν πρώτη κάθοδος ἐ[γέν]ετο τοιαύτη.

27. Πεισίστρατον: MS. πισιστρατον. 30. Πεισίστρατον: MS. πισιστρατον. 32. φησίν: MS. φη. 33. Κολλυτοῦ: MS. κολυτου, with a second τ written above the first and what may be a second λ above the first λ. 34. Θρᾷτταν: apparently θρατταν in the MS.; another τ has been written above the line, apparently to correct the first of those in the word itself, which is badly formed. 35. συνεισήγαγεν: so apparently MS., not κατήγαγεν, as 1st ed. and K-W. Richards suggested εἰσήγαγεν. 36. Πεισίστρατος: MS. πισιστρατος. 38. θαυμάζοντες: om. H-L., after Richards.

It may be noticed that according to this arrangement the embassy of Croesus to Greece, to make an alliance with the most powerful Greek state, falls in the second tyranny of Pisistratus. This is quite in harmony with the words of Herodotus (I. 59), *τὸ μὲν Ἀττικὸν κατεχόμενόν τε καὶ διεσπασμένον ἐπυνθάνετο ὁ Κροῖσος ὑπὸ Πεισιστράτου τοῦ Ἱπποκράτεος, τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον τυραννεύοντος Ἀθηναίων.* According to this passage Athens was at that time under Pisistratus, but his rule was not yet firmly established and was still threatened by rival parties; a state of things such as we suppose to have existed during the second period of tyranny.

29. *ἀρχαϊκῶς καὶ λίαν ἁπλῶς*: Prof. Mayor (*Class. Rev.* V. 121) cites Plut. *Sol. c.* 3, *ἐν δὲ τοῖς φυσικοῖς ἁπλοῦς ἐστι λίαν καὶ ἀρχαῖος.*

33. *στεφανόπωλιν*: so Athenaeus, XIII. p. 609.

36. *παραιβατούσης*: Cleidemus (fr. 24, *ap.* Athen. *l.c.*) uses the same word in the same connection, *ἐξέδωκε δὲ καὶ Ἱππάρχῳ τῷ υἱεῖ τὴν παραιβατήσασαν αὐτῷ γυναῖκα Φύην* (referred to by Reinach, p. xxv).

μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, ὡς ἐξέπεσε τὸ δεύτερον ἔτει μάλιστα
ἑβδόμῳ μετὰ τὴν κάθοδον,—οὐ γὰρ πολὺν χρόνον
κατεῖχεν, ἀλλ[ὰ] διὰ τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαι τῇ τοῦ
Μεγακλέους θυγατρὶ συγγίγνεσθαι φοβηθεὶς ἀμ-
2 φοτέρας τὰς στάσεις ὑπεξῆλθεν· καὶ πρῶτον μὲν
συνῴκισε περὶ τὸν Θερμαῖον κόλπον χωρίον ὃ
καλεῖται Ῥαίκηλος, ἐκεῖθεν δὲ παρῆλθεν εἰς τοὺς
περὶ Πάγγαιον τόπους, ὅθεν χρηματισάμενος καὶ
στρατιώτας μισθωσάμενος, ἐλθὼν εἰς Ἐρέτριαν
ἑνδεκάτῳ πάλιν ἔτει τότε πρῶτον ἀνασῴσασθαι βίᾳ
τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπεχείρει, συμπροθυμουμένων αὐτῷ πολ-

XV. 2. ὡς: K-W. believe the MS. to have τ, which they strike out in their text; but this is not enough to fill the space, and the ω seems fairly clear. H-L., after Gennadios, αὖθις, which is too much for the space. 3. ἑβδόμῳ: K-W. alter to τρίτῳ. 4. κατεῖχεν: MS. κατέσχεν, altered by Wyse, K-W., H-L. 5. συγγίγνεσθαι: MS. συγγινεσθαι. 7. συνῴκισε: H-L. ᾤκισε, after Gennadios and Hude. 8. Ῥαίκηλος: so corrected in the MS. from ρακηδος. 11. τότε: so K-W. and H-L. after Blass; MS. τό. ἀνασῴσασθαι: MS. ανασωσασθαι, H-L. and K-W.[2] ἀνακτήσασθαι, reading ἀναστήσασθαι in the MS.; but the ω seems certain.

XV. 2. ὡς ἐξέπεσε κ.τ.λ.: the construction of this sentence is ungrammatical, as there is no principal sentence on which the clause ὡς ἐξέπεσε can depend. The syntax can be restored by striking out καί before πρῶτον μέν and taking οὐ γὰρ . . ὑπεξῆλθεν as a parenthesis; but it is more probable that Aristotle broke off his original construction at οὐ γάρ, and forgot to resume it.

3. ἑβδόμῳ: it has been objected (*e.g.* by Rühl) that the refusal of Pisistratus to fulfil his compact must have led to a breach in less than six years, and it has been proposed to read μηνί for ἔτει. But the ground is too uncertain to justify the change; and Prof. Gomperz ingeniously suggests that the daughter of Megacles may not have been of a marriageable age when the alliance was made, so that the actual marriage would have been deferred for some years.

6. πρῶτον μὲν κ.τ.λ.: Aristotle is fuller than Herodotus in his account of the movements of Pisistratus during his second exile. His mention of the residence at Rhaicelus and in the neighbourhood of Pangaeus explains the reference in Herodotus to the supplies which Pisistratus drew ἀπὸ Στρυμόνος ποταμοῦ. Herodotus mentions no other place of retirement than Eretria, while it appears from Aristotle that he did not go to that place until he was already supplied with men and money for his descent on Athens.

λῶν μὲν καὶ ἄλλων, μάλιστα δὲ Θηβαίων καὶ
Λυγδάμιος τοῦ Ναξίου, ἔτι δὲ τῶν ἱππέων τῶν
ἐχόντων ἐν Ἐρετρίᾳ τὴν πολιτείαν. νικήσας δὲ 3
[Col. 6.] *τὴν ἐπὶ Παλληνίδι [μάχη]ν καὶ λαβὼν [τὴν ἀρχὴ]ν*
καὶ παρελόμενος τοῦ δήμου τὰ ὅπλα κατεῖχεν
ἤδη τὴν τυραννίδα βεβαίως, καὶ Νάξον ἑλὼν
ἄρχοντα κατέστησε Λύγδαμιν. παρείλε[το] δὲ τοῦ 4
δήμου τὰ ὅπλα τόνδε τὸν τρόπον. ἐξοπλισίαν ἐν
τ[ῷ] Θησείῳ ποιησάμενος ἐκκλησιάζειν ἐπεχείρει,
[τῆς δὲ φωνῆς ἐχάλ]ασεν μικρόν· οὐ φασκόντων δὲ
κατακούειν ἐκέλευσεν αὐτοὺς προσαν[α]βῆ[ναι] πρὸς
τὸ πρόπυλον τῆς ἀκροπόλεως ἵνα γεγωνῇ μᾶλλον.
ἐν ᾧ δ' ἐκεῖνος διέτριβε δημηγορῶν, ἀνελόντες

18. *καὶ Νάξον ἑλών*: so K-W. (but adding *γάρ* after *καί*) apparently correctly. 1st ed. and H-L. *καὶ εἰς Νάξον ἐλθών*. 19. *παρείλετο*: so restored by Rutherford, K-W., H-L. *δέ* appears to be in the MS., not a supplement as marked by K-W. 20. *ἐξοπλισίαν*: MS. *εξοπλασιαν*, which is retained by K-W. and Kontos, on the authority of some inscriptions. 21. *Θησείῳ*: the first three letters are written in straggling and ill-formed characters, and are partially obliterated; but it is practically certain that this is the reading and not *Ἀνακείῳ*, as was read (from Polyaenus) in the first edition. K-W. and H-L. adhere to *Ἀνακείῳ*, the former reading the initial *α* at the end of the preceding line (which is impossible), the latter in the same line with the rest of the word. 22. *τῆς δὲ φωνῆς ἐχάλασεν*: so Kontos, by far the happiest suggestion yet made for this passage. H-L. [*ἐπίτηδες δ' ἐφώνη*]*σε*, after Tyrrell and Gertz (but approve of Kontos' supplement in their preface). K-W. [*φθέγγεσθαι δ' ἐσπούδ*]*ασεν*. 25. *διέτριβε*: MS. *διετρειβε*.

16. *τὴν ἐπὶ Παλληνίδι μάχην*: the scholiast on Aristoph. *Acharn.* 234 refers to this passage: *Παλλήναδε· οἱ Παλληνεῖς δῆμός ἐστι τῆς Ἀττικῆς, ἔνθα Πεισιστράτῳ βουλομένῳ τυραννεῖν καὶ Ἀθηναίοις ἀμυνομένοις αὐτὸν συνέστη πόλεμος . . . . μέμνηται δὲ τούτου καὶ Ἀνδροτίων καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ* (Rose, *Frag.* 355).

19. *παρείλετο δὲ κ.τ.λ.*: the story of this stratagem is told by Polyaenus (*Strateg.* I. 21, 2).

22. *τῆς δὲ φωνῆς ἐχάλασεν μικρόν*: this restoration by Kontos (for which he refers to Lucian, *Bis Accus.* 21, Aelian, *Hist. An.* xii. 46) suits the sense well. The sense, as appears from Polyaenus, is that Pisistratus intentionally spoke in a somewhat inaudible voice, and when the people complained that they could not hear him invited them to a more convenient spot, to which they followed him, leaving behind their arms, which they had stacked according to custom.

οἱ ἐπὶ τούτῳ τεταγμένοι τὰ ὅπλα αὐτῶν [καὶ συγ]κλῄσαντες εἰς [τὰ] πλησίον οἰκήματα τοῦ Θησείου διεσήμηναν ἐλθόντες πρὸς τὸν Πεισίστρατον·

5 *ὁ δὲ [ἐπεὶ τ]ὸν ἄλλον λόγον ἐπετέλεσεν, εἶπε καὶ περὶ τῶν ὅπλων τὸ γεγονός, [καὶ ὡς οὐ χρὴ] θαυμάζειν οὐ[δ' ἀ]θυμεῖν, ἀλλ' ἀπελθόντας ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδίων εἶναι, τῶν δὲ κοινῶν [αὐτὸς ἐπι]μελήσεσθαι πάντων.*

16. *[Ἡ μὲν οὖν Πει]σιστράτου τυραννὶς ἐξ ἀρχῆς τε κατέστη [τοῦτον] τὸν τρόπον καὶ [μεταβο]λὰς ἔσχεν τοσαύτας.*

2 *διῴκει δ' ὁ Πεισίστρατος, ὥσπερ εἴρηται [ἤδη], τὴν πόλιν μετρίως καὶ μᾶλλον πολιτικῶς ἢ τυραννικῶς· ἔν τε γὰρ τοῖς ἄλλοις [φι]λάνθρωπος ἦν καὶ πρᾶος καὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσι συγγνωμονικός, καὶ δὴ καὶ τοῖς ἀ[πό]ροι[ς] προεδάνειζε χρ[ήμα]τα πρὸς τὰς ἐργασίας, ὥστε διατρέφεσθαι γεωργοῦντας.*

3 *τοῦτο δ' ἐποίει δυοῖν [χά]ριν, ἵν[α] μήτε ἐν τῷ ἄστει διατρίβωσιν ἀλλὰ διεσπαρμένοι κατὰ τὴν χώραν, καὶ ὅπως [εὐπο]ροῦντες τῶν μετρίων καὶ πρὸς τοῖς*

26. *τούτῳ*: so Rutherford; MS. *τουτων*. *Cf.* *ην* for *ηι* (26, 28), *εξην* for *εξηι* (27, 22), *Ληναιων* for *Ληναιωι* (57, 5). After this word there is an erasure of one or two letters in the MS. K-W. *τοῦτο*, H-L. *τοῦτ' ἐπιτεταγμένοι*. 28. *Πεισίστρατον*: MS. *πισιστρατον*. 30. *καὶ ὡς οὐ χρή*: so H-L.; 1st ed. *λέγων ὡς οὐ χρή*, but the space will not admit of so much. K-W. *ἔφη δ' οὐ δεῖν*. 31. *ἀθυμεῖν*: this reading is due to K-W. H-L. *[ἀγανακτ]εῖν*. 32. *αὐτὸς ἐπιμελήσεσθαι*: so supplied by Blass and others. H-L. insert *νῦν* after *αὐτός*. XVI. 3. *Πεισίστρατος*: MS. *πισιστρατος*. *εἴρηται ἤδη*: 1st ed. and H-L. *εἰρήκαμεν*, but the abbreviated termination of *εἴρηται* seems visible. The hiatus is the only objection. 5. *τοῖς ἄλλοις*: H-L. *τ[αῖς ὁμιλίαις]* doubtfully, but the reading is fairly certain. 8. *διατρέφεσθαι γεωργοῦντας*: so MS.; a second *γ* has been written above the first letter of *γεωργοῦντας*, which is badly formed. H-L. *διανεκὲς ἐγεωργοῦντο*, misled by the *διαμπερὲς ἐγεωργοῦντο* of the 1st ed. 10. *διεσπαρμένοι*: H-L. add *ὦσι*, after Kontos.

XVI. 9. *τοῦτο δ' ἐποίει κ.τ.λ.*: *cf.* Aristotle, *Pol.* V. 11, where the house of Pisistratus is mentioned among the tyrants who undertook great public works as a means of keeping the people poor and constantly occupied.

[ἰ]δίοις ὄντες μήτ' ἐπιθυμῶσι μήτε σχολάζ[ωσιν]
ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τῶν κοινῶν. ἅμα δὲ συνέβαινεν αὐτῷ 4
καὶ τὰς προσόδους γίγνεσθαι μ[είζο]υς ἐξεργαζομένης
τῆς χώρας· ἐπράττετο γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν γιγνομένων
δεκάτην. διὸ καὶ τοὺς κατὰ [δήμ]ους κατεσκεύαζε 5
δικαστάς, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξῄει πολλάκις εἰς τὴν χώραν
ἐπισκοπῶν [καὶ] διαλ[ύ]ων τοὺς διαφερομένους,
ὅπως μὴ καταβαίνοντες εἰς τὸ ἄστυ παραμελῶσι
τῶν [ἀγρ]ῶν. τοιαύτης γάρ τινος ἐξόδου τῷ Πεισι- 6
στράτῳ γιγνομένης συμβῆναί φασι τὰ περὶ τὸν ἐν
τῷ [Ὑμητ]τῷ γεωργοῦντα τὸ κληθὲν ὕστερον χωρίον
ἀτελές. ἰδὼν γάρ τινα παττάλῳ πέτρας σκάπτοντα
καὶ ἐργαζόμενον, διὰ τὸ θαυμάσαι τὸν πα[ῖδα]
ἐκέλευεν [ἐρ]έσθαι τί γίγνεται ἐκ τοῦ χωρίου· ὁ δ',

14. *γίγνεσθαι*: MS. *γινεσθαι*. *ἐξεργαζομένης*: H-L. *ἐξ ἐργαζομένης*. 16. *κατεσκεύαζε*: K-W. *κατεσκεύασε*. 17. *ἐξῄει*: MS. *εξηει*. 18. *διαλύων*: 1st ed. and H-L. *διαλλάττων*, for which there is not room. 20. *Πεισιστράτῳ*: MS. *πισιστρατωι*: and similarly in ll. 27, 29, 34. 21. *τά*: H-L. *τό*. 22. *Ὑμηττῷ*: MS. perhaps *υμμητωι*. 23. *παττάλῳ*: K-W. *π. . . λω[ς]*, Wessely *παντελῶς*, H-L. *πρεσβύτην*, which the MS. will not admit of. *πέτρας*: K-W. and Wessely [*ἐν*] *πέτραις*, thinking the MS. to read *πετραισκαπτοντα*, which is possible, but there is not room for the preposition. 24. *διὰ τὸ θαυμάσαι*: bracketed by K-W. and suspected by H-L. *παῖδα*: so H-L., K-W.; 1st ed. *πάτταλον*, for which there is hardly room, even in abbreviated form. 25. *γίγνεται*: K-W. think there is space for *περιγίγνεται*, but there does not seem to be any lacuna between *τί* and *γίγνεται*.

16. *δεκάτην*: Boeckh (*Staatsh.*[3] I. 398, bk. III. 6) mentions this tithe, but the evidence has hitherto been of doubtful authority. Thucydides (VI. 54) mentions an *εἰκοστή* as levied by the Pisistratidae (his phrase perhaps including Pisistratus himself also), and both Grote and Abbott speak of this as the only tax of the kind then levied, Grote expressly refusing to accept the evidence for the higher tax.

22. *Ὑμηττῷ*: the reading is doubtful, but this is the locality named by Apostolius (*cf.* next note).

23. *παττάλῳ*: the word is very doubtful, except the first two letters, but the only substitute yet proposed which suits the traces in the MS., *παντελῶς*, is not very satisfactory. The story is told, though not in the same words, by several of the collectors of proverbs (*cf.* Zenobius, iv. 76; Apostolius, x. 80).

*ὅσα κακὰ καὶ ὀδύναι, ἔφη, καὶ τούτων τῶν κακῶν καὶ
τῶν [ὀ]δυνῶν Πεισίστρατον δεῖ λαβεῖν τὴν δε[κά]-
την. ὁ μὲν οὖν ἄνθρωπος [ἀ]πε[κρί]νατο ἀγνοῶν, ὁ
δὲ Πεισίστρατος ἡσθεὶς διὰ τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὴν*
7 *φιλεργίαν [ἀ]τελῆ ἁπάντων ἐποίησεν αὐτόν. οὐδὲν
δὲ τὸ πλῆθος οὐδ' ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις παρώχλει κατὰ τὴν
ἀρχήν, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ π[α]ρεσκ[εύ]αζεν εἰρήνην καὶ ἐ[τ]ήρει
τὴν ἡσυχίαν· διὸ καὶ πολλάκις [παρῳμιάζ]ετο ὡς
[ἡ] Πεισιστράτου τυραννὶς ὁ ἐπὶ Κρόν[ου] βίος εἴη·
συνέβη γὰρ ὕστερον διὰ [τὴν ὕβριν] τῶν υἱέων*
8 *πολλῷ γενέσθαι τραχυτέραν τὴν ἀρχήν. μέγιστον
δὲ πάντων ἦν [τῶν ἐπαινου]μένων τὸ δημοτικὸν εἶναι
τῷ ἤθει καὶ φιλάνθρωπον. ἔν τε γὰρ τοῖς ἄλλο[ις
εἰώθει] πάντα διοικεῖν κατὰ τοὺς νόμους, οὐδεμίαν
ἑαυτῷ πλεονεξίαν διδ[ούς, καί ποτ]ε προσκληθεὶς
φόνου δίκην εἰς Ἄρειον πάγ[ον] αὐτὸς μὲν ἀπήντησεν
ὡς [ἀπολο]γησόμενος, ὁ δὲ προσκαλεσάμενος φοβη-*
9 *θεὶς ἔλιπεν. διὸ καὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἔμεινεν ⟨ἐν⟩ [ἀρχῇ
καὶ] ὅτ' ἐκπέσοι πάλιν ἀπελάμβανε ῥᾳδίως. ἐβούλοντο
γὰρ καὶ τῶν γνωρίμων καὶ τῶν [δημο]τικῶν οἱ πολλοί·
τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ταῖς ὁμιλίαις τοὺς δὲ ταῖς εἰς τὰ ἴδια*

26, 27. *τῶν κακῶν καὶ τῶν ὀδυνῶν*: H-L. del.; K-W. bracket second *τῶν*. 28. *ἀγνοῶν*: H-L. prefix *αὐτόν*. 31. *παρώχλει*: J. B. Mayor *παρηνώχλει*, followed by H-L., K-W.; but *παροχλέω* is found in Theophrastus, and neither word is common. 33. *παρῳμιάζετο*: H-L. [*ὕστερον ἐλέγετο*], K-W. [*τοῦτ' ἐλέ*]*γετο*, Wessely *ἐθρύλησαν*, the first letters of which appear consistent with the traces in the MS., but not the last. 35. *τὴν ὕβριν*: supplied by Sidgwick, Gennadios, K-W., H-L. 37. *τῶν ἐπαινουμένων*: supplied by J. B. Mayor, Newman, K-W., H-L. 39. *εἰώθει*: K-W. [*προηρεῖτο*]. 43. *ἔλιπεν*: H-L. *ἐξέλιπεν*, after Richards. *ἐν ἀρχῇ*: so H-L.; Blass and K-W. *ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ*. A *χ* appears visible, but after *ἔμεινεν* there is a down-stroke like that of a *φ*, with space for five or six letters after it. 44. *καὶ ὅτ'*: part of what appears to be a mark of abbreviation is visible in such a position as to make it certain that *ὅτε*, not *ὁπότε* nor *εἴτε*, is the word used. *ἀπελάμβανε*: so Wyse, Gennadios, Ferrini, H-L.; MS. *επελαμβανε*, Richards, K-W. *ἀνελάμβανε*.

40. *καί ποτε προσκληθεὶς κ.τ.λ.*: *cf.* Arist. *Pol.* V. 12, Plut. *Sol.* 31.

βοηθείαις προ[σ]ήγετο, καὶ πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους ἐπεφύ-
κει καλῶς. ἦσαν δὲ καὶ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις οἱ περὶ τῶν 10
[τυ]ράννων νόμοι πρᾶοι κατ' ἐκείνους τοὺς καιροὺς
οἵ τ' ἄλλοι καὶ δὴ καὶ ὁ μάλιστα καθ[ήκ]ων πρὸς τὴν
τῆς τυραννίδος ⟨κατάστασιν⟩. νόμος γὰρ αὐτοῖς
ἦν ὅδε· θέσμια τάδε Ἀθηναί[ων ἐστὶ] πάτρια, ἐάν
[τιν]ες τυραννεῖν ἐπανιστῶ[ν]ται † ἐπὶ τυραννίδι †
⟨ἤ⟩ τι⟨ς⟩ συγκαθιστῇ τὴν τυραννίδα ἄτιμον εἶναι
αὐτὸν καὶ γένος.

17. *Πεισίστρατος μὲν οὖν ἐγκατεγήρασε τῇ ἀρχῇ*
καὶ ἀπ[έθ]ανε νοσήσα[ς ἐπὶ] Φιλόνεω ἄρχοντος, ἀφ'
οὗ μὲν κατέστη τὸ πρῶτον τύραννος ἔτη τριά[κο]ν[τ]α
καὶ τρία βιώσας, ἃ δ' ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ διέμεινεν ἑνὸς δέοντα
εἴκοσι· ἔφ[ευγ]εν γὰρ τὰ λοιπά. διὸ καὶ φανερῶς 2

47. *προσήγετο*: the letters are faint, but the reading is fairly certain. 50. *καθήκων*: H-L. *κα[θεστώς]* doubtfully, K-W. emend *ἀνήκων*. 51. *κατάστασιν*: not in MS., but this seems the most satisfactory restoration of the passage. That there is some confusion in the MS. is shown by the two articles before *τυραννίδος*, therefore some correction is necessary. H-L. read *τά* for *τήν* in the MS., perhaps misled by the facsimile. K-W. accept *κατάστασιν* in a note as possible, but mark a lacuna in the text. 52. *ἐστί*: K-W. [*κατὰ τά*]. 53. *ἐπὶ τυραννίδι*: probably this was originally written as a correction of *τυραννεῖν*, as being the commoner construction after *ἐπανίστημι*. The infinitive is, however, confirmed by the law (quoted as 'Solon's') in Andoc. *De Myst.* § 97, p. 13. 13, *ἐάν τις τυραννεῖν ἐπαναστῇ ἢ τὸν τύραννον συγκαταστήσῃ*. 54. *ἤ τις*: *η* and *τι* are almost identical in some of the forms of these letters, and it is possible that the MS. reading is intended to be simply *ἢ συγκαθιστῇ*: but the characters appear rather more like *τι*, and *τις* seems to be required, and the corruption is easily explained by the similarity of the letters. K-W. read *τι*, but correct to *ἤ*. *τὴν τυραννίδα*: H-L. *συνωμοσίαν*, against the MS., which is faint but legible. *εἶναι*: H-L. *εἶναι καί*, which is possible. XVII. 1. *Πεισίστρατος*: MS. *πισιστρατος*, and similarly in ll. 6, 15, but not l. 11. *ἐγκατεγήρασε*: MS. *ενκατεγηρασε*, which Rutherford would retain. 5. *ἔφευγεν*: so J. B. Mayor, Rutherford, H-L., K-W.; it is doubtful if the lacuna in the MS. will hold three letters, but the sense requires the imperfect, and if the scribe wrote *ἔφυγεν* it must have been by mistake.

XVII. 2. *ἐπὶ Φιλόνεω ἄρχοντος*: the name of Philoneos does not occur in the list of archons previously known to us, but may now be inserted for the year 527 B.C. On the chronology of Pisistratus' life here summarised, see notes on ch. 14, ll. 2 and 25.

λῃροῦσιν ⟨οἱ⟩ φάσκοντες ἐρώμενον εἶναι Πεισί- [Col. 7.]
στρατον Σόλωνος καὶ στρατηγεῖν ἐν τῷ πρὸς Με-
γαρέας πολέμῳ περὶ Σαλαμῖνος· οὐ γὰρ ἐνδέχεται
ταῖς ἡλικίαις ἐάν τις ἀναλογίζηται τὸν ἑκατέρου
3 βίον καὶ ἐφ' οὗ ἀπέθανεν ἄρχοντος. τελευτήσαντος
δὲ Πεισιστράτου κατεῖχον οἱ υἱεῖς τὴν ἀρχήν, προά-
γοντες τὰ πράγματα τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον. ἦσαν δὲ
δύο μὲν ἐκ τῆς γαμετῆς, Ἱππίας καὶ Ἵππαρχος, δύο
δ' ἐκ τῆς Ἀργείας, Ἰοφῶν καὶ Ἡγησίστρατος, ᾧ
4 παρωνύμιον ἦν Θετταλός. ἔγημεν γὰρ Πεισίστρατος
ἐξ Ἄργους ἀνδρὸς Ἀργείου θυγατέρα, ᾧ ὄνομα ἦν
Γοργίλος, Τιμώνασσαν, ἣν πρότερον ἔσχεν γυναῖκα
Ἀρχῖνος ὁ Ἀμπρακιώτης τῶν Κυψελιδῶν· ὅθεν καὶ
ἡ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀργείους ἐνέστη φιλία, καὶ συνεμα-
χέσαντο χίλιοι τὴν ἐπὶ Παλληνίδι μάχην Ἡγησισ-
τράτου κομίσαντος. γῆμαι δέ φασι τὴν Ἀργείαν οἱ
μὲν ἐκπεσόντα τὸ πρῶτον, οἱ δὲ κατέχοντα τὴν ἀρχήν.

6. λῃροῦσιν οἱ: so K-W., H-L., Lacon, Hude; MS. λῃρουσι, which may perhaps stand. 8. Σαλαμῖνος: MS. σαλαμεινος. 11. προάγοντες: so Rutherford, Blass, K-W., H-L.; MS. προαγαγοντες. 13. H-L. insert Ἀττικῆς before γαμετῆς. 19. ἐνέστη: H-L. συνέστη. 20. Ἡγησιστράτου the correct reading of this word was due first to a suggestion by J. B. Mayor.

13. ἐκ τῆς γαμετῆς: the name of Pisistratus' first wife is not known.

14. Ἡγησίστρατος, ᾧ παρωνύμιον ἦν Θετταλός: Thessalus is mentioned by Thucydides (I. 20) and also by Plutarch (*Cato*, 24), who calls him the son of Pisistratus and Timonassa; Hegesistratus is named by Herodotus (V. 94), who calls him παῖδα νόθον γεγονότα ἐξ Ἀργείης γυναικός; but there has been nothing hitherto to show their identity. Pisistratus must have been regularly married to Timonassa, if the union was accompanied by an alliance with Argos; and the term νόθος, applied to him by Herodotus, probably means only that he was not of Athenian birth on both sides, and consequently was not legally qualified for citizenship. Hence it is unnecessary to insert πρώτης before γαμετῆς in l. 13, as Bury proposes, or Ἀττικῆς as van Herwerden.

22. κατέχοντα τὴν ἀρχήν: this must refer to the first tyranny, since during the second Pisistratus was married (or at least betrothed) to the

18. Ἦσαν δὲ κύριοι μὲν τῶν πραγμάτων διὰ τὰ ἀξιώματα καὶ διὰ τὰς ἡλικίας Ἵππαρχος καὶ Ἱππίας, πρεσβύτερος δ' ὢν ὁ Ἱππίας καὶ τῇ φύσει πολιτικὸς καὶ ἔμφρων ἐπεστάτει τῆς ἀρχῆς. ὁ δὲ Ἵππαρχος παιδιώδης καὶ ἐρωτικὸς καὶ φιλόμουσος ἦν, καὶ τοὺς περὶ Ἀνακρέοντα καὶ Σιμωνίδην καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ποιητὰς οὗτος ἦν ὁ μεταπεμπόμενος· Θετταλὸς δὲ 2
νεώτερος πολὺ καὶ τῷ βίῳ θρασὺς καὶ ὑβριστής. ἀφ' οὗ καὶ συνέβη τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτοῖς γενέσθαι

XVIII. 1. μὲν τῶν: so Blass, Richards, K-W., H-L.; MS. των μεν.

daughter of Megacles. Timonassa must have died before this date; she could not have been repudiated in order to facilitate the arrangement with Megacles, without breaking the friendly relations with Argos.

XVIII. 5. τοὺς περὶ Ἀνακρέοντα καὶ Σιμωνίδην: the presence of these two poets at Athens under the patronage of Hipparchus is also mentioned in the pseudo-Platonic dialogue *Hipparchus*, p. 228 C.

8. νεώτερος πολύ: as Timonassa (see note on ch. 17, l. 22) was apparently dead in 551 B.C., Thessalus' birth cannot be placed later than that year, and it may be safer to put it a year earlier, in 552 B.C., which would make him seventeen when he brought the Argive troops to aid his father at Pallene. Hippias and Hipparchus were lads (νεηνίαι, Herod. I. 61) at the time of the marriage with the daughter of Megacles; and if that took place at the beginning of the second tyranny (551 B.C.), Hippias, the elder, can hardly have been born later than 567 B.C. (this would make him seventy-seven at Marathon, which suits well enough with Herodotus' narrative, VI. 107). Hipparchus' birth may then be placed about 565 B.C., which would make him thirteen years older than Thessalus; and a much smaller interval would not suit Aristotle's phrase. Hipparchus was consequently over fifty at the time of his murder. Thessalus was about thirty-eight at the same time, which perhaps favours the view that he, and not Hipparchus, was responsible for the circumstances which led to the conspiracy.

9. ἀφ' οὗ καὶ συνέβη κ.τ.λ.: in the first edition the opinion was expressed that, in face of the direct testimony of Thucydides, it seemed impossible to refer the relative to its natural antecedent, Thessalus (or his character, it being perfectly immaterial whether it be taken as masculine or neuter); and consequently it was suggested that the words Θετταλὸς . . . ὑβριστής were parenthetical. But such a treatment of the

πάντων τῶν κακῶν. ἐρασθεὶς γὰρ τοῦ Ἁρμοδίου καὶ διαμαρτάνων τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν φιλίας, οὐ κατεῖχε τὴν ὀργὴν ἀλλ' ἔν τε τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐνεσημαίνετο πικ[ρ]ῶς, καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον μέλλουσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀδελφὴν κανηφορεῖν Παναθηναίοις ἐ[κώ]λυσεν λοιδορήσας τι τὸν Ἁρμόδιον ὡς μαλακὸν ὄντα, ὅθεν συνέβη παροξυνθέντα τὸν Ἁρμόδιον καὶ τὸν

13. *πικρῶς*: so rightly read by K-W.; Richards and H-L. *τὸ πικρόν*, after *ἐνεσήμαινε τὸ πικρόν* of 1st ed. 16. *παροξυνθέντα*: H-L. *παροξυνθέντας*, but space forbids.

Greek seems unjustifiable. It is certainly strange that no mention is made of Thessalus in the narrative of the conspiracy; but in any case it is evident that Hippias, and not the perpetrator of the outrage, was the primary object of the murderers. Among the fragments of Heraclides *περὶ πολιτείας Ἀθηναίων* (preserved in a Vatican MS., *cf.* Rose, *Frag.* 611, ed. 1886), a work which was evidently an epitome of Aristotle, is the following summary of this passage, but so confused as to lend no assistance beyond showing that the clause referring to Thessalus is an authentic part of the text. *Πεισίστρατος λγ ἔτη τυραννήσας γηράσας ἀπέθανεν. Ἵππαρχος ὁ υἱὸς Πεισιστράτου παιδιώδης ἦν καὶ ἐρωτικὸς καὶ φιλόμουσος, Θεσσαλὸς δὲ νεώτερος καὶ θρασύς. τοῦτον τυραννοῦντα μὴ δυνηθέντα* (or *-ες*) *ἀνελεῖν Ἵππαρχον ἀπέκτεινε* (or *-αν*) *τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. Ἱππίας δὲ πικρότατα ἐτυράννει. καὶ τὸν περὶ ὀστρακισμοῦ νόμον εἰσηγήσατο, ὃς ἐτέθη διὰ τοὺς τυραννιῶντας. καὶ ἄλλοι τε ὠστρακίσθησαν καὶ Ξάνθιππος καὶ Ἀριστείδης.*

Whether the narrative of Thucydides or of Aristotle is the more probable is another question. Neither had first-hand knowledge of the events in question. Thucydides wrote a century after the events recorded, Aristotle nearly two centuries. Thucydides evidently believed himself to have special knowledge on the subject and speaks with authority, and the authority of Thucydides is no light matter. On the other hand, M. Weil has pointed out that in the introductory section of his work, which was evidently written later than the rest, he silently corrects his previous narrative in at least one point (*cf.* note on l. 20); and in the apparently gratuitous mention of Thessalus (I. 20) M. Weil thinks there may be an indication that he had discovered his error in another. As Hipparchus was the person killed, it is quite natural that tradition after the event should suppose him to have been the culpable party. Aristotle silently, but somewhat pointedly, corrects several of the details of Thucydides' narrative in the sixth book; so it is not impossible that he also differed from him as to the person whose conduct provoked the conspiracy.

*Ἀριστογείτονα πράττειν τὴν πρᾶξιν μετὰ πολιτῶν
πολλῶν. ἤδη δὲ [παρατη]ροῦντες ἐν ἀκροπόλει* 3
*τοῖς Παναθηναίοις Ἱππίαν (ἐτύγχανεν γὰρ οὗτος
μὲν [δ]εχόμενος, ὁ δ' Ἵππαρχος ἀποστέλλων τὴν
πομπήν), ἰδόντες τινὰ τῶν κοινωνούντων τῆς πρά-
[ξ]εως φιλανθρώπως ἐντυγχάνοντα τῷ Ἱππίᾳ καὶ
νομίσαντες μηνύειν, βουλόμενοί τι δρᾶσαι πρὸ τῆς
συλλήψεως, καταβάντες καὶ προεξαναστάντες τῶν
[ἄλλων] τὸν μὲν Ἵππαρχον διακ[οσ]μοῦντα τὴν
πομπὴν παρὰ τὸ Λεωκόρειον ἀπέκτειναν, τὴν δ'
ὅλην ἐλυμήναντο πρᾶξιν· αὐτῶν δ' ὁ μὲν Ἁρμό-* 4

17. *μετὰ πολιτῶν πολλῶν*: the first four letters of *πολιτῶν* are doubtful. K-W. *μετὰ συνει⟨δό⟩των ⟨οὐ⟩ πολλῶν*, after J. B. Mayor; H-L. *μετ' [ἄλλων οὐ] πολλῶν, et alii alia.* 20. *μὲν δεχόμενος*: so rightly read by K-W., H-L. 25. *ἄλλων*: K-W. [*ἑτέρων*], but K-W². [*ἄλλων*]. 26. *παρά*: H-L. *περί*. *τὴν δ'*: so K-W., apparently rightly, H-L. [*ᾧ τήν*], 1st ed. [*τὴν μὲν οὖν*]. 27. *δ'*: K-W. *γάρ*, against MS.

17. *πολιτῶν*: Thucydides (VI. 56) expressly says that the conspirators were *not* many in number, *ἦσαν δὲ οὐ πολλοὶ οἱ ξυνομωμοκότες ἀσφαλείας ἕνεκα.* If the reading is right, it is an intentionally pointed correction of Thucydides.

18. *ἐν ἀκροπόλει*: this differs from the account of Thucydides, who says that Hippias was in the Ceramicus, organising the procession, when Harmodius and Aristogeiton were alarmed by seeing one of their confederates talking to him. The account of Thucydides is more in detail than that of Aristotle, and particularises that the two murderers, on being thus alarmed, rushed *inside the gates* till they met Hipparchus. It is moreover not likely that any of those who were going to take part in the procession would be in the Acropolis while the procession had not yet started. Aristotle's account is, however, also consistent with itself, in saying that they came *down* from the Acropolis before they found Hipparchus.

20. *ὁ δ' Ἵππαρχος ἀποστέλλων τὴν πομπήν*: this again is not in accordance with Thucydides' account in VI. 55, where he says it was Hippias who was arranging the procession; but it agrees with I. 20, *τῷ Ἱππάρχῳ περιτυχόντες . . . πομπὴν διακοσμοῦντι.*

26. *παρὰ τὸ Λεωκόρειον*: the exact phrase of Thucydides in VI. 55, which shows Arnold's conjecture *περί* (from I. 20, here repeated by van Leeuwen) to be unnecessary.

διος εὐθέως ἐτελεύτησεν ὑπὸ τῶν δ[ορυφό]ρων, ὁ
δ' Ἀριστο[γε]ίτων ὕστερον συλληφθεὶς καὶ πολὺν
χρόνον αἰκισθείς. κατηγόρησεν δ' ἐν [τ]αῖς ἀνάγ-
καις πολλῶν οἳ καὶ [τῇ] φύσει τῶν ἐπιφανῶν καὶ
φίλοι τοῖς τυράννοις ἦσαν. οὐ [γὰρ ἐ]δύναντο
παραχρῆμα λαβεῖν οὐδὲν ἴχνος τῆς πράξεως, ἀλλ'
ὁ λεγόμενος λόγος ὡς ὁ Ἱππίας ἀποστήσας ἀπὸ
τῶν ὅπλων τοὺς πομπεύοντας ἐφώρασε τοὺς τὰ
ἐγχειρίδια ἔχοντας οὐκ ἀληθής ἐστιν· οὐ γὰρ
ἔπεμπον τό⟨τε⟩ μεθ' ὅπλων, ἀλλ' ὕστερον τοῦτο κατε-
5 *σκεύασεν ὁ δῆμος. κατηγόρει δὲ τῶν τοῦ τυράννου*
φίλων, ὡς μὲν οἱ δημοτικοί φασιν, ἐπίτηδες ἵνα
ἀσεβήσαιεν ἅμα καὶ γένοιντο ἀσθενεῖς ἀνελόντες
τοὺς ἀναιτίους καὶ φίλους ἑαυτῶν, ὡς δ' ἔνιοι
λέγουσιν, οὐχὶ πλαττόμενος ἀλλὰ τοὺς συνειδότας
6 *ἐμήνυεν. καὶ τέλος ὡς οὐκ ἠδύνατο πάντα ποιῶν*
ἀποθανεῖν, ἐπαγγειλάμενος ὡς ἄλλους μηνύσων

36. *ἀληθής*: MS. *αληθες*. There is a stroke in the margin opposite this line, as though to call attention to something questionable in it. 37. *ἔπεμπον τότε*: so Rutherford, Blass, H-L., K-W., *etc.*; MS. *επεμποντο*. 40. *ἀσεβήσαιεν*: H-L. *ἀσεβήσειαν*. *ἀσθενεῖς*: written above the line, over *ἀνελόντες*. The first *σ* is strangely formed, half the *θ* is obliterated, and the two following letters might admit of other interpretations. H-L. *ἐναγεῖς*, after Richards, Rutherford, Gennadios, Kontos, Hude, reading the MS. *αγεννεις*, as in 1st ed. 43. *ἠδύνατο*: H-L. *ἐδύνατο*.

29. *πολὺν χρόνον αἰκισθείς*: Thucydides' *οὐ ῥᾳδίως διετέθη*.

34. *ὁ λεγόμενος λόγος κ.τ.λ.*: this is the story given by Thucydides. In favour of his version it is to be noticed that if this fact be false the reason which he gives for the selection of the occasion of the Panathenaea for the attempt, namely, that then people could appear in arms without attracting suspicion, falls to the ground. On the other hand it is perhaps unlikely that the tyrants should have allowed the populace to carry arms on any occasion whatever; and the conspirators might still select a time for their attempt when a great number of people would be collected together from all parts of Attica. Moreover Aristotle would hardly have made a direct assertion as to the later origin of the practice of carrying arms at this festival unless he had been sure of the facts.

πολλοὺς καὶ πείσας αὐτῷ τὸν Ἱππίαν δοῦναι τὴν δεξιὰν πίστεως χάριν, ὡς ἔλαβεν ὀνειδίσας ὅτι τῷ φονεῖ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τὴν δεξιὰν δέδωκε οὕτω παρώξυνε τὸν Ἱππίαν ὥσθ' ὑπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς οὐ κατεῖχεν ἑαυτὸν ἀλλὰ σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν διέφθειρεν αὐτόν.

19. *Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα συνέβαινεν πολλῷ τραχυ-
τέραν εἶναι τὴν τυραννίδα· καὶ γὰρ διὰ τὸ τιμωρεῖν
τῷ ἀδελφῷ καὶ διὰ τὸ πολλοὺς ἀνῃρηκέναι καὶ
ἐκβεβληκέναι πᾶσιν ἦν ἄπιστος καὶ πικρός. ἔτει* 2
*δὲ τετάρτῳ μάλιστα μετὰ τὸν Ἱππάρχου θάνατον,
ἐπεὶ κακῶς εἶχεν τὰ ἐν τῷ ἄστει, τὴν Μουνιχίαν
ἐπεχείρησε τειχίζειν, ὡς ἐκεῖ μεθιδρυσόμενος. ἐν
τούτοις δ' ὢν ἐξέπεσεν ὑπὸ Κλεομένους τοῦ Λακε-
δαιμονίων βασιλέως, χρησμῶν γιγνομένων ἀεὶ τοῖς
Λάκωσι καταλύειν τὴν τυραννίδα διὰ τοιάνδ' α[ἰτίαν].
οἱ φυγάδες, ὧν οἱ Ἀλκμεωνίδαι προειστήκεσαν,* 3
αὐτοὶ μὲν δι' αὑτῶν οὐκ ἐδύναντο ποιήσασθαι τὴν
[Col. 8.] *κάθοδον, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ προσέπταιον· ἔν τε γὰρ τοῖς
ἄλλοις οἷς ἔπραττον διεσφάλλοντο, καὶ τειχίσαντες*

45. *αὐτῷ*: H-L. *αὑτῷ*. 46. After *ὅτι*, *ταδελ* is written in MS., but struck out. 47. *τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ*: MS. *ταδελφου*, which K-W. retain. 48. *κατεῖχεν*: MS. at first *κατεσχεν*, but corrected. XIX. 2. *τιμωρεῖν*: K-W. *τιμωρῶν*, against MS. 3. *τῷ ἀδελφῷ*: *ταδελφωι*, MS., K-W. *καὶ διὰ τό*: bracketed by K-W. XIX. 4. *πικρός*: MS. *π·στº*, which can stand for nothing but *πιστός*, and must be a slip of the copyist: *πικρός* is sufficiently near to explain the blunder. 6. *κακῶς*: MS. at first *εν κακωι*, but corrected. *Μουνιχίαν*: MS. *μουνυχιαν*. 7. *ἐκεῖ*: *ἐκεῖσε*, J. B. Mayor, Sidgwick, H-L. 8. *Λακεδαιμονίων*: so apparently MS., as read by K-W². ; H-L. gave the same reading as correction of *Λακεδαίμονος*, which was believed to be the MS. reading by themselves, K-W., and 1st ed. 9. *γιγνομένων*: MS. *γινομενων*. 12. *ἐδύναντο*: MS. *ηδυναντο*, *cf.* Meisterhans, p. 134.

XIX. 6. *τὴν Μουνιχίαν ἐπεχείρησε τειχίζειν*: this circumstance is not mentioned in the extant historians. For the spelling of the name, *cf.* Meisterhans, p. 23.

ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ Λειψύδριον τὸ ὑπὲρ Πάρνηθος, εἰς ὃ συνεξῆλθόν τινες τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἄστεως, ἐξεπολιορκήθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν τυράννων, ὅθεν ὕστερον μετὰ ταύτην τὴν συμφορὰν ᾖδον ἐν τοῖς σκολίοις αἰεί·

αἰαῖ Λειψύδριον προδωσέταιρον,
οἵους ἄνδρας ἀπώλεσας μάχεσθαι
ἀγαθούς τε καὶ εὐπατρίδας,
οἳ τότ' ἔδειξαν οἵων πατέρων ἔσαν.

4 *ἀποτυγχάνοντες οὖν ἐν ἅπ[α]σι τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐμισθώσαντο τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖς νεὼν οἰκοδομεῖν ὅθεν εὐπό-*

15. *Λειψύδριον*: MS. *λιψυδριον*, and so also in l. 19. 17. *μετά*: K-W. *εἰς*, from Etym. Mag. 361. 33, but the phrase there (*σκόλιον εἰς αὐτοὺς ᾖδετο*) is not a verbal quotation. 18. *αἰεί*: H-L. delete, K-W. bracket, as a dittography. 21. *καὶ εὐπατρίδας*: so also in Athenaeus, Suidas, and Etym. Mag. Tyrrell *κἀξ εὐπατριδᾶν*, *metri gratia*, Bury *ἀγαθούς, καλούς, εὐπατρίδας*. 22. *οἳ τότ'*: Etym. Mag. *ὁπότ'*.

15. *Λειψύδριον*: there is a reference to this passage in Schol. Aristoph. *Lysist.* 666, *Λειψύδριον· χωρίον τῆς Ἀττικῆς περὶ τὴν Πάρνηθον εἰς ὃ συνῆλθόν τινες τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἄστεος, ὥς φησιν Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ* (Rose, *Frag.* 356). The passage of the same scholiast (l. 665) on *λυκόποδες*, referring to Aristotle as using this name for the bodyguard of the tyrants, which Rose includes under the same number, is evidently from some other work. The scholiast (l. 1153) further refers to Aristotle as his authority for the summary which he gives of the expulsion of the Pisistratidae through the agency of the Spartans, in which one or two phrases are verbally quoted from the present passage (Rose, *Frag.* 357).

19. *αἰαῖ Λειψύδριον*: this song is also quoted by Athenaeus (XV. 695, scol. 22), and in Etym. Mag. *s. v.* *ἐπὶ Λειψυδρίῳ μάχῃ*. The compiler of the latter work seems, from other phrases used by him (*e.g.* *ὧν οἱ Ἀλκμαιωνίδαι προεστήκεσαν*), to have had the work of Aristotle before him.

24. *ὅθεν εὐπόρησαν χρημάτων*: H-L. and K-W. place the comma before these words, not after them, and the latter mark a lacuna after *χρημάτων*, to be supplied with words to the effect of *καὶ ἀνέπεισαν τὴν Πυθίαν συνεργεῖν ἑαυτοῖς*. H-L. believe the passage seriously corrupt. But (1) the Alcmeonidae did not derive their wealth from the Delphic contract, which, on the contrary, they partly executed at their own expense (Herod. V. 62); (2) the phrase *ὅθεν εὐπόρησαν χρημάτων* plainly corresponds to Herodotus' *οἷα δὲ χρημάτων εὖ ἥκοντες* (*ib.*). It therefore seems simpler to understand *ὅθεν* as = *ἀφ' ὧν*.

ρησαν χρημάτων, πρὸς τὴν τῶν Λακώνων βοήθειαν.
ἡ δὲ Πυθία προέφερεν αἰεὶ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις
χρηστηριαζομένοις ἐλευθεροῦν τὰς Ἀθήνας, εἰς
τοῦθ᾽ ἕως προὔτρεψε τοὺς Σπαρτιάτας, καίπερ
ὄντων ξένων αὐτοῖς τῶν Πεισιστρατιδῶν· συνε-
βάλλετο δὲ οὐκ ἐλάττω μοῖραν τῆς ὁρμῆς τοῖς
Λάκωσιν ἡ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀργείους τοῖς Πεισιστρατίδαις
ὑπάρχουσα φιλία. τὸ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον Ἀγχίμολον 5
ἀπέστειλαν κατὰ θάλατταν ἔχοντα στρατιάν. ἡττη-
[θέν]τος δ᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ τελευτήσαντος διὰ τὸ Κινέαν
βοηθῆσαι τὸν Θετταλὸν ἔχοντα χιλίους ἱππεῖς,
προσοργισθέντες τῷ γενομένῳ Κλεομένην ἐξέ-
πεμψαν τὸν βασιλέα στόλον ἔχοντα μείζω κατὰ γῆν,
ὃς ἐπεὶ τοὺς τῶν Θετταλῶν ἱππεῖς ἐνίκησεν κωλύ-
οντας αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν παριέναι, κατακλείσας
τὸν Ἱππίαν εἰς τὸ καλούμενον Πελαργικὸν τεῖχος
ἐπολιόρκει μετὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων. προσκαθημένου 6

27. *εἰς τοῦθ᾽ ἕως*: so Blass, followed by Ferrini, H-L., K-W.; MS. *εις τουτ ευθεως*; *εἰς ὃ* (or *ἔστε*) *τελευτῶσα*, Poste. 29. *συνεβάλλετο*: H-L. *συνεβάλετο*, after Richards. 35. *Θετταλόν*: MS. *θεσσαλον*, retained by K-W., and so l. 38; *cf.* Meisterhans, p. 77. *χιλίους*: MS. *χειλιους*. 36. *προσοργισθέντες*: H-L. *παροργισθέντες*, after Naber. 39. *κατακλείσας*: K-W. and H-L. *κατακλήσας*, but *cf.* Meisterhans, pp. 28–30.

29. *συνεβάλλετο δὲ κ.τ.λ.*: this certainly helps to explain the action of the Spartans in expelling the Pisistratidae, but there is no reason to doubt that the reiterated command of the Delphic oracle had a great influence over them in the matter.

32. *Ἀγχίμολον*: in Herodotus (V. 63) the name is given as *Ἀγχιμόλιος*, but in the note of the scholiast on Aristophanes, referred to above, the Ravenna MS. reads *Ἀγχίμολος*.

38. *κωλύοντας αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν παριέναι*: so Herodotus (V. 64), *ἐσβαλοῦσι εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν χώρην*.

40. *τὸ καλούμενον Πελαργικὸν τεῖχος*: the form *Πελαργικόν* is confirmed by the scholiast on Aristophanes, while *Πελασγικόν* is used in the parallel passage in Herodotus (V. 64) and in Thuc. II. 17.

δ' αὐτοῦ συνέπεσεν ὑπεξιόντας ἁλῶναι τοὺς τῶν Πεισιστρατιδῶν υἱεῖς· ὧν ληφθέντων ὁμολογίαν ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν παίδων σωτηρίᾳ ποιησάμενοι καὶ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἐν πένθ' ἡμέραις ἐκκομισάμενοι παρέδωκαν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἐπὶ Ἁρπακτίδου ἄρχοντος, κατασχόντες τὴν τυραννίδα μετὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς τελευτὴν ἔτη μάλιστα ἑπτακαίδεκα, τὰ δὲ σύμπαντα σὺν οἷς ὁ πατὴρ ἦρξεν ἑνὸς δεῖν πεντήκοντα.

42. *ὑπεξιόντας*: so Wyse, K-W., H-L.; MS. *επεξιοντας*. 43. *Πεισιστρατιδῶν*: MS. *πισιστρατιδων*. 46. *Ἁρπακτίδου*: a letter (apparently *π*) has been struck out before the name, and the *τ* (which may perhaps be *ιτ*) is an addition above the line. 49. *δεῖν*: so J. E. B. Mayor, Sidgwick, K-W.; MS. *δει*, as in 27, 9, which H-L. retain, holding that otherwise *δέοντα* would be necessary.

42. *ὑπεξιόντας*: this is restored in place of the MS. reading *ἐπεξιόντας*, as being more in accordance with the narrative of Herodotus, which Aristotle evidently follows in this part of this work, *ὑπεκτιθέμενοι γὰρ ἔξω τῆς χώρης οἱ παῖδες τῶν Πεισιστρατιδέων ἥλωσαν* (V. 65). *ἐπεξιόντας* would mean that they were taken in an attempt to force their way out by a sally.

46. *ἐπὶ Ἁρπακτίδου ἄρχοντος*: the name is a new one in the list of archons, and must be placed in the year 511 B.C. The expulsion of the Pisistratidae occurred in the fourth year of Hippias' sole rule (Thuc. VI. 59, *παυθεὶς ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ*), which began in 514 B.C. It therefore falls in the official year 511–10 B.C. This harmonises with the statement below that the archonship of Isagoras, which was certainly in 508 B.C., was in the fourth year after the expulsion. The only statement which is not strictly in accordance with it is that of Thucydides (*l. c.*) that Hippias fought at Marathon in the twentieth year after his expulsion. It was actually twenty years and a few months afterwards; but there is no reason to press the round number of Thucydides to the full extent of literal accuracy.

49. *ἑνὸς δεῖν πεντήκοντα*: the scholiast on Aristoph. *Wasps*, 502, quotes Aristotle as saying that the tyranny lasted forty-one years (Rose, *Frag.* 358), but probably K-W. are right in correcting *ἓν* to *ἐννέα* in that place. The forty-nine years named by Aristotle of course represent the total period from the first tyranny of Pisistratus to the expulsion of his sons, ignoring the periods of exile; while the thirty-six years which Herodotus assigns (V. 65) include only the years of actual rule. It may be noticed that the latter total supports the period of nineteen years of government given to Pisistratus in the present work, as against the seventeen mentioned in the *Politics* (*cf.* note on ch. 14, l. 25).

20. *Καταλυθείσης δὲ τῆς τυραννίδος ἐστασίαζον
πρὸς ἀλλ[ήλ]ους Ἰσαγόρας ὁ Τεισάνδρου, φίλος ὢν
τῶν τυράννων, καὶ Κλεισθένης τοῦ γένους ὢν τῶν
Ἀλκμεωνιδῶν. ἡττημένος δὲ ταῖς ἑταιρείαις ὁ
Κλεισθένης προσηγάγετο τὸν δῆμον, ἀποδιδοὺς τῷ
πλήθει τὴν πολιτείαν. ὁ δὲ Ἰσαγόρας ἐπιλειπό- 2
μενος τῇ δυνάμει πάλιν ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸν Κλεο-
μένην, ὄντα ἑαυτῷ ξένον, συνέπεισεν ἐλαύνειν τὸ
ἄγος, διὰ το τοὺς Ἀλκμεωνίδας δοκεῖν εἶναι τῶν
ἐναγῶν. ὑπεξελθόντος δὲ τοῦ Κλεισθένους μετ' 3
ὀλίγων, ἠγηλάτει τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἑπτακοσίας οἰκίας·
ταῦτα δὲ διαπραξάμενος τὴν μὲν βουλὴν ἐπειρᾶτο
καταλύειν, Ἰσαγόραν δὲ καὶ τριακοσίους τῶν φίλων
μετ' αὐτοῦ κυρίους καθιστάναι τῆς πόλεως. τῆς δὲ
βουλῆς ἀντιστάσης καὶ συναθροισθέντος τοῦ πλή-
θους, οἱ μὲν περὶ τὸν Κλεομένην καὶ Ἰσαγόραν
κατέφυγον εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν· ὁ δὲ δῆμος δύο μὲν
ἡμέρας προσκαθεζόμενος ἐπολιόρκει, τῇ δὲ τρίτῃ
Κλεομένην μὲν καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ πάντας ἀφίεσαν
ὑποσπόνδους, Κλεισθένη δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους φυ-
γάδας μετεπέμψαντο. κατασχόντος δὲ τοῦ δήμου τὰ* 4

XX. 2. Τεισάνδρου: MS. *τισανδρου*. 4. Ἀλκμεωνιδῶν: MS. *αλκμεονιδων*. *ἡττημένος*: Blass, H-L., K-W. *ἡττώμενος*, from Herod. V. 66. 6. *ἐπιλειπόμενος*: *ἀπολειπόμενος*, Richards, Kontos, H-L., both here and in 27, 23 and 34, 28; but such repeated instances seem to confirm one another as indicating the usage of the writer. 14. *μετ' αὐτοῦ*: MS. *μ' του*, *i.e.* *μετα του*. 19. *ἀφίεσαν*: *ἀφεῖσαν* K-W. 20. Κλεισθένη: MS. *-νην*, *cf.* 22, l. 4.

XX. 1. *ἐστασίαζον πρὸς ἀλλήλους κ.τ.λ.*: in this account of the rise, expulsion, and recall of Cleisthenes Aristotle follows Herodotus (V. 66, 69, 70, 72) closely and sometimes almost verbally.

19. *πάντας ἀφίεσαν ὑποσπόνδους*: from the account of Herodotus it appears that this applies only to the Lacedaemonian force with Cleomenes, as the Athenians who were in the Acropolis were all put to death, with the exception of Isagoras.

πράγματα Κλεισθένης ἡγεμὼν ἦν καὶ τοῦ δήμου προστάτης. αἰτιώτατοι γὰρ σχεδὸν ἐγένοντο τῆς ἐκβολῆς τῶν τυράννων οἱ Ἀλκμεωνίδαι, καὶ στασιάζοντες τὰ πολλὰ διετέλεσαν. ἔτι δὲ πρότερον τῶν Ἀλκμεωνιδῶν Κήδων ἐπέθετο τοῖς τυράννοις· διὸ καὶ ᾖδον καὶ εἰς τοῦτον ἐν τοῖς σκολίοις·

ἔγχει καὶ Κήδωνι, διάκονε, μηδ' ἐπιλήθου,
εἰ χρὴ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσιν οἰνοχοεῖν.

21. Διὰ μὲν οὖν ταύτας τὰς αἰτίας ἐπίστευεν ὁ δῆμος τῷ Κλεισθένει. τότε δὲ τοῦ πλήθους προεστηκὼς ἔτει τετάρτῳ μετὰ τὴν τῶν τυράννων κατά-

24. *στασιάζοντες*: H-L. *ἀντιστασιάζοντες*. 26. *Ἀλκμεωνιδῶν*: MS. *αλκμεονιδων*. XXI. 1. *ἐπίστευεν*: so at first in the MS., but altered to *ἐπίστευον*. *Cf.* 35, 25, where the MS. has *ἐφ' οἷς ἔχαιρον ἡ πόλις*. It is possible that *ὁ δῆμος* is a gloss which had been incorporated in the MS. from which this was copied, the verb having been altered to correspond with it, while in revision another MS. may have been used. K-W. bracket *ὁ δῆμος*, and so Rutherford and Bury.

26. Κήδων: of this person and his attempt to expel the tyrants nothing seems to be known, but it must be one of the various attacks which the exiles are said to have made upon the Pisistratidae in the later years of the reign of Hippias (*supr.* ch. 19), among which was the disastrous occupation of Leipsydrium. It is not clear whether τῶν Ἀλκμεωνιδῶν is to be taken as a partitive genitive after Κήδων or as dependent on πρότερον, whether, that is, Cedon was an Alcmeonid or not. Reinach takes the former view, Kaibel and Kiessling, Poland, Zuretti and Ferrini the latter.

28. ἔγχει κ.τ.λ.: quoted by Athenaeus (XV. 695, scol. 21), where, however, the reading of the second line is *εἰ δὴ χρὴ ἀγαθοῖς*.

XXI. 3. ἔτει τετάρτῳ . . . ἐπὶ Ἰσαγόρου ἄρχοντος: the archonship of Isagoras is fixed by Dion. Hal. (*Ant.* I. 74, V. 1) as occurring in 508 B.C. The Parian marble places it seventeen years before the battle of Marathon, but in this case it must be in error. As it is clear from Dionysius that the archonship of Isagoras was in an Olympic year, it must be that which began in July, 508 B.C. This is the fourth official year after the expulsion of the Pisistratidae, which occurred (as appears from ch. 19) in the official year 511–10 B.C., seemingly in the early part of 510 B.C.

The note of time in this passage shows that the constitution of

λυσιν ἐπὶ Ἰσαγόρου ἄρχοντος, πρῶτον μὲν συν- 2
ένειμε πάντας εἰς δέκα φυλὰς ἀντὶ τῶν τεττάρων,
ἀναμεῖξαι βουλόμενος ὅπως μετάσχωσι πλείους τῆς
πολιτείας· ὅθεν ἐλέχθη καὶ τὸ μὴ φυλοκρινεῖν
[Col. 9.] πρὸς τοὺς ἐξετάζειν τὰ γένη βουλομένους. ἔπειτα 3
τὴν βουλὴν πεντακοσί[ους] ἀντὶ τετρακοσίων κ[ατ]έστησεν, πεντήκοντα ἐξ ἑκάστης φυλῆς· τότε δ'

4. *συνένειμε*: so Newman, Kontos, Gertz, H-L. (*cf.* 41, 10); MS. *ουν ενειμε*, K-W. *οὖν συνένειμε*, marking a lacuna after *ἄρχοντος*; *ἔνειμε* alone Blass, *διένειμε* Wyse. 6. *ἀναμεῖξαι*: MS. *αναμιξαι* (Meisterhans, p. 144).

Cleisthenes was not drawn up until after the expulsion of Cleomenes and Isagoras. This would have been probable *a priori*, as there was not time to have introduced such extensive constitutional changes before the Spartan invasion; but the order in which the occurrences are mentioned by Herodotus has misled some historians into supposing the contrary.

4. After *ἄρχοντος* K-W. mark a lacuna, believing that Aristotle must have made some direct reference to the fact that Cleisthenes introduced a large number of new citizens; *cf. Pol.* III. 2, p. 1275ᵇ 36 *πολλοὺς ἐφυλέτευσε ξένους καὶ δούλους μετοίκους*.

7. *τὸ μὴ φυλοκρινεῖν*: the meaning of this phrase apparently is that since the *φυλαί* after the reforms of Cleisthenes no longer bore any relation to the *γένη*, it was useless to enter on an examination of the tribes for the purpose of reviewing the lists of the *γένη*. Cleisthenes wished to break up the old tribal division for political purposes, so as to do away with all the old aristocratic traditions and associations which no doubt stood in the way of the lower classes when they wished to take part in public life. Therefore, while retaining the name *φυλαί*, he made his new tribes of a number to which the number of the old tribes bore no integral proportion, so that it was not possible to form the new ones out of any of the existing subdivisions of the old. A number of persons were admitted to the new tribes who had not been members of the old, and these were not necessarily entered on the rolls of any of the *γένη*. Formerly, on any review of the citizen-roll, it was no doubt usual to go through it tribe by tribe, following all the subdivisions of the old patriarchal system. Now the tribe-roll had no relation to that of the *γένη*, and consequently those persons who wished to examine the latter would have nothing to do with distinctions of tribes. The phrase seems, from the way in which Aristotle introduces it, to have become a proverbial one, perhaps for making useless distinctions; and this, rather than any

ἦ[σα]ν ἑκατόν. διὰ τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ εἰς δώ[δε]κα φυλὰς συνέταξεν, ὅπ[ως α]ὐτῷ μὴ συμβαίνῃ μερίζειν κατὰ τὰς προϋπαρχούσας τριττῦς· ἦσαν γὰρ ἐκ δ̄ φυλῶν δώδεκα τριττύες, ὥστ' οὐ [συν]έπιπτεν ⟨ἂν⟩ ἀναμίσγεσθαι τὸ πλῆθος.

4 *διένειμε δὲ καὶ τὴν χώραν κατὰ δήμους τριάκοντα μέρη, δέκα μὲν τῶν περὶ τὸ ἄστυ, δέκα δὲ τῆς παραλίας, δέκα δὲ τῆς μεσογείου, καὶ ταύτας ἐπονομάσας τριττῦς ἐκλήρωσεν τρεῖς εἰς τὴν φυλὴν ἑκάστην, ὅπως ἑκάστη μετέχῃ πάντων τῶν τόπων· καὶ δημότας ἐποίησεν ἀλλήλων τοὺς οἰκοῦντας ἐν ἑκάστῳ τῶν δήμων, ἵνα μὴ πατρόθεν προσαγορεύοντες ἐξελέγχωσιν τοὺς νεοπολίτας,*

13. *κατά*: MS. at first *προς*, but corrected. 14. *συνέπιπτεν*: MS. apparently *σ'επειπτεν*: *συνέπιπτεν ἄν* Hude, K-W., *οὐκ ἂν συνέπιπτεν* Richards, H-L.; but the omission is more easily explained if *ἄν* immediately preceded *ἀναμίσγεσθαι.*

stricter sense, may be its meaning in Thuc. VI. 18, where it is to be preferred to the otherwise unknown *φιλοκρινεῖν*.

15. *διένειμε δὲ καὶ τὴν χώραν κατὰ δήμους τριάκοντα μέρη*: this passage does nothing to clear up the difficulty as to the number of the demes which arises from the words of Herodotus (V. 69). It merely explains how the local sub-division of the tribes was managed so as to secure that the territories of each should be scattered over the whole of Attica. The fact that the tribes were so sub-divided has of course been well known, not, however, from any direct statement by Herodotus or other ancient author, but from the fact that the various demes of the several tribes are found in different parts of the country. It appears from the present passage that each tribe had three sub-divisions, one in each of the three districts into which Attica had formerly been divided. We are not told how many demes there were in each trittys; but if the text of Herodotus is correct in saying that there were ten in each tribe, it follows that they must have been unevenly distributed among the trittyes; and this must anyhow have been the case as the number of the demes gradually increased up to the total of 174, to which we know it had attained in the third century B.C. (Polemo *ap.* Strabo, IX. 1, p. 396). The demes composing each trittys appear to have been contiguous.

22. *ἐξελέγχωσιν τοὺς νεοπολίτας*: Cleisthenes introduced a large number of new citizens by the enfranchisement of emancipated slaves

ἀλλὰ τῶν δήμων ἀναγορεύωσιν· ὅθεν καὶ καλ[οῦ]σιν Ἀθηναῖοι σφᾶς αὐτοὺς τῶν δήμων. κατέστησε δὲ καὶ δημάρχους τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχοντας ἐπιμέλειαν τοῖς πρότερον ναυκράροις· καὶ γὰρ τοὺς δήμους ἀντὶ τῶν ναυκραριῶν ἐποίησεν. προσηγόρευσε δὲ τῶν δήμων τοὺς μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν [τ]όπ[ων], τοὺς δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν κτισάντων· οὐ γὰρ ἅπαντες ὑπῆρχον ἔτι τοῖς

23. After *καί* K-W. insert *νῦν*. 25. *ἐπιμέλειαν* : MS. *επιμελιαν*. 29. *ἅπαντες ὑπῆρχον ἔτι* : H-L. *ἅπασιν ὑπῆρχεν ὀνόματα*, after Bury; Berl. Pap. *ἅπαντες ὑπῆρχον ἐν*.

and resident aliens, and he made their reception into the community easier by altering the official mode of designation. If described by their father's name alone, the new citizens who, so to speak, 'had no father,' would be easily distinguished from the older citizens, who were proud of their family pedigrees; but by adding the name of the deme as part of the necessary description a novelty was introduced into the designation of all alike, and the fact of a man having a deme would be sufficient proof of his being a citizen, which in the case of those newly admitted to the franchise would not be obvious from the unfamiliar and sometimes foreign name of his father.

24. *κατέστησε δὲ καὶ δημάρχους . . . ἐποίησεν*: quoted by Harpocration (*s. v. ναυκραρικά*) as from *Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ*, and he refers to the same passage *s.v. δήμαρχος* (Rose, *Frag.* 359). The second Berlin fragment (Blass, *Hermes* XV, Diels, *Berl. Acad.* 1885) also begins at the same place, with the exception of the single word *Ἀθηναῖοι* standing in the preceding line; and it was through the identity of the remains of the first sentence with the quotation in Harpocration that Bergk (*Rhein. Mus.* 1881, p. 91) first proved the Berlin fragments to belong to Aristotle's work. The fragment now in question includes twenty-five lines, but only twelve or fourteen letters in each are visible. The first word legible is *Ἀθηναῖοι*, as mentioned above: the last which can be identified are *[φυ]λῆς ἑκάστης*. This passage is also quoted by a scholiast on Aristophanes (*Clouds*, 37), but we do not know whether he quoted first hand (Rose, ed. 1886, *Frag.* 397).

29. *οὐ γὰρ ἅπαντες ὑπῆρχον ἔτι τοῖς τόποις*: the sense apparently is that not all the demes still corresponded to localities possessing names, and it is an explanation of the last clause of the preceding sentence. In the redistribution (and probably increase in the number) of the demes some of them were assigned to places which had no particular names, and to these names were given *ἀπὸ τῶν κτισάντων*. This gives a good sense, though rather strangely expressed, so that the

6 *τόποις. τὰ δὲ γένη καὶ τὰς φρατρίας καὶ τὰς ἱερωσύνας εἴασεν ἔχειν ἑκάστους κατὰ τὰ πάτρια. ταῖς δὲ φυλαῖς ἐποίησεν ἐπωνύμ[ους] ἐκ τῶν προκριθέντων ἑκατὸν ἀρχηγετῶν οὓς ἀνεῖλεν ἡ Πυθία δέκα.*

22. *Τούτων δὲ γενομένων δημοτικωτέρα πολ[ὺ τῆς Σ]όλωνος ἐγένετο ἡ πολιτεία· καὶ γὰρ συνέβη τοὺς μὲν Σόλωνος νόμους ἀφανίσαι τὴν τυραννίδα διὰ τὸ μὴ χρῆσθαι, καινοὺς δ' ἄλλους θεῖναι τὸν Κλεισθένη*

30. *φρατρίας*: MS. *φατριας*. 32. *ἐπωνύμους*: so the Berl. Pap. XXII. 4. *καινούς*: so apparently MS., partly confirmed by Berl. Pap. (*χρασθαι και* . . .); K-W. read MS. as *και τους*, but emend it to *καινούς*; H-L. [*νόμ*]*ους*.

alteration made by H-L. (after Bury) is unnecessary. Mr. J. B. Mayor adopts the suggestion (made in the first edition) to read *ἅπασιν*, in which case the phrase explains the *first* clause of the preceding sentence, 'for the founders were not in all cases still known.'

30. *τὰ δὲ γένη κ.τ.λ.*: Cauer (p. 46) quotes this passage as contradicting *Pol.* VII (VI). 4, p. 1319ᵇ 19, which runs as follows: *ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα κατασκευάσματα χρήσιμα πρὸς τὴν δημοκρατίαν, οἷς Κλεισθένης τε Ἀθήνησιν ἐχρήσατο βουλόμενος αὐξῆσαι τὴν δημοκρατίαν, καὶ περὶ Κυρήνην οἱ τὸν δῆμον καθιστάντες. φυλαί τε γὰρ ἕτεραι ποιητέαι πλείους καὶ φρατρίαι καὶ τὰ τῶν ἰδίων ἱερῶν συνακτέον εἰς ὀλίγα καὶ κοινά, καὶ πάντα σοφιστέον ὅπως ἂν ὅτι μάλιστα ἀναμιχθῶσι πάντες ἀλλήλοις, αἱ δὲ συνήθειαι διαζευχθῶσιν αἱ πρότερον.* This passage is a useful commentary on the present account of Cleisthenes' reforms, but it does not necessarily contradict it. Unless we suppose that the reforms of Cyrene were exactly the same as Cleisthenes', the second clause would naturally refer to them, as the first unquestionably does to the Athenian legislation. Meyer's explanation (p. 52 ff.), that the phrase in the *Politics* is justified by the fact that Cleisthenes probably introduced new religious rites for the *φρατρίαι* created for the new citizens, is unsatisfactory, as the phrase clearly implies a reduction in the number of such rites, not an increase. Cleisthenes did not disturb the existing *φρατρίαι*, nor their rites, but merely created new ones; and his breaking up of the old associations was sufficiently accomplished by the re-arrangement of the tribes and demes, upon which the political life of Athens rested.

33. *οὓς ἀνεῖλεν ἡ Πυθία*: the share which the Delphic oracle had in choosing the names of the ten Cleisthenean tribes is mentioned in the Etym. Mag. p. 369, 16, *ταῦτα δὲ τὰ δέκα ὀνόματα ἀπόροις* (K-W. corr. *ἀπὸ ρ'*) *ὁ Πύθιος εἵλετο*, and Lex. Demosth. Patm. (p. 15, ed. Sakk.), *τούτους γὰρ ἐξ ὀνομάτων ἑκατὸν ὁ θεὸς ἐξελέξατο* (Rose, *Frag.* 429, and ed. 1886, *Frag.* 469).

στοχαζόμενον τοῦ πλήθους, ἐν οἷς ἐτέθη καὶ ὁ περὶ
τοῦ ὀστρακισμοῦ νόμος. πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἔτει 2
† πέμπτῳ † μετὰ ταύτην τὴν κατάστασιν ἐφ' Ἑρμου-
κρέοντος ἄρχοντος τῇ βουλῇ τοῖς πεντακοσίοις τὸν
ὅρκον ἐποίησαν ὃν ἔτι καὶ νῦν ὀμνύουσιν· ἔπειτα
τοὺς στρατηγοὺς ᾑροῦντο κατὰ φυλάς, ἐξ ἑκάστης
φυλῆς ἕνα, τῆς δὲ ἁπάσης στρατιᾶς ἡγεμὼν ἦν ὁ
πολέμαρχος. ἔτει δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα δωδεκάτῳ νική- 3
σαντες τὴν ἐν Μαραθῶνι μάχην ἐπὶ Φαινίππου
ἄρχοντος, διαλιπόντες ἔτη δύο μετὰ τὴν νίκην,

7. Ἑρμουκρέοντος: Ἑρμοκρέοντος, K-W., H-L., Kontos. There is a division of lines after ερμου-, and it is possible that the scribe thought the word ended there, and accordingly added an υ to the original Ἑρμο-.

XXII. 7. ἐφ' Ἑρμουκρέοντος ἄρχοντος: the dates here given absolutely refuse to harmonise. The reforms of Cleisthenes have been above assigned to the archonship of Isagoras in 508 B.C. The year denoted by ἔτει πέμπτῳ μετὰ ταύτην τὴν κατάστασιν would therefore naturally be 504 B.C. But in the first place that year is already appropriated by the name of Acestorides, and, secondly, in the next sentence it is said that the battle of Marathon occurred in the twelfth year afterwards. The date of Marathon being unquestionably 490 B.C., this places the archonship of Hermoucreon in 501 B.C., for which year no name occurs in the extant lists. We must therefore suppose either that the reforms of Cleisthenes extended over three years, which is improbable, or that Aristotle has omitted some necessary note of time (so Keil, taking ἔπειτα in l. 9. to cover a space of three years), or that πέμπτῳ is a mistake for ὀγδόῳ (ε' for η'); the latter solution is perhaps the most probable, and is approved by H-L.

10. τοὺς στρατηγούς: it has generally been stated (*e.g.* by Grote) that the office of στρατηγός was created by Cleisthenes, but it has already been seen in ch. 4 that it was at least as old as the time of Draco. Cleisthenes did not even, as it now appears, increase their number to ten nor make them the chief officers of the state. Under his constitution the archons, who were elected directly by the assembly (*cf.* below, note on l. 27), were still the chief magistrates of the state; and the ten strategi were only elected at the date here indicated as subordinates to the polemarch.

θαρροῦντος ἤδη τοῦ δήμου, τότε πρῶτον ἐχρήσαντο τῷ νόμῳ τῷ περὶ τὸν ὀστρακισμόν, ὃς ἐτέθη διὰ τὴν ὑποψίαν τῶν ἐν ταῖς δυνάμεσιν, ὅτι Πεισίστρατος δημαγωγὸς καὶ στρατηγὸς ὢν τύραννος κατέστη·
4 *καὶ πρῶτος ὠστρακίσθη τῶν ἐκείνου συγγενῶν*

16. *τὸν ὀστρακισμόν*: K-W. alter to *τοῦ ὀστρακισμοῦ*. 17. *ὅτι*: MS. *οτε*, K-W. *ὁ γάρ*. **Πεισίστρατος**: MS. *πισιστρατος*.

17. *ὅτι* **Πεισίστρατος** *κ.τ.λ.*: MS. *οτε*, which makes nonsense of the passage. It has just been said that the law of ostracism was passed by Cleisthenes. *Cf.* also the quotation from Harpocration below, in which this sentence is repeated with slight variation. The law was passed in consequence of the lesson taught by the career of Pisistratus, and was aimed especially at the supporters of his house who still remained in Athens. It was not put into force, however, owing (according to Aristotle) to the usual leniency of the democracy (and in respect of this testimony it may be remembered that Aristotle is not by any means an extreme admirer of democracy); but when the Persian invasion and the attempt to betray Athens immediately after the battle of Marathon showed that there was still much danger to be expected from the partisans of Hippias, it was natural that strong measures should be adopted and the leading adherents of the tyranny expelled. The only wonder is that two years were allowed to elapse after Marathon before the first ostracism; but probably in the first satisfaction with the victory it was thought that nothing further would be attempted against Greece, and it was only when it was known that Darius was making preparations for another and more formidable invasion, that precautions were taken by ostracising Hipparchus and other members of the same party.

19. *πρῶτος ὠστρακίσθη . . . Ἵππαρχος*: *cf.* Harpocration, *s.v.* *Ἵππαρχος, ἄλλος δέ ἐστιν Ἵππαρχος ὁ Χάρμου, ὥς φησι Λύκουργος ἐν τῷ κατὰ Λεωκράτους· περὶ δὲ τούτου Ἀνδροτίων ἐν τῇ β′ φησὶν ὅτι συγγενὴς μὲν ἦν Πεισιστράτου τοῦ τυράννου καὶ πρῶτος ἐξωστρακίσθη, τοῦ περὶ τὸν ὀστρακισμὸν νόμου τότε πρῶτον τεθέντος διὰ τὴν ὑποψίαν τῶν περὶ Πεισίστρατον, ὅτι δημαγωγὸς ὢν καὶ στρατηγὸς ἐτυράννησεν.* As a matter of fact the Hipparchus mentioned by Lycurgus (*Contr. Leocr.* p. 164) is not the son of Charmus, but of Timarchus. The words *ὅτι . . . ἐτυράννησεν* are so nearly identical with those of Aristotle that the one author must have drawn from the other. The date of Androtion is doubtful, but it appears more probable that he lived somewhat later than Aristotle, quite at the close of the fourth century. (A writer in the New York *Nation* of May 7th says that this uncertainty is not justifiable, and that Androtion cannot have been other than the opponent of Demosthenes [*Or.* 22]; M. Weil, in the

Ἵππαρχος Χάρμου Κολλυτεύς, δι᾽ ὃν καὶ μάλιστα τὸν νόμον ἔθηκεν ὁ Κλεισθένης, ἐξελάσαι βουλόμενος αὐτόν. οἱ γὰρ Ἀθηναῖοι τοὺς τῶν τυράννων φίλους, ὅσοι μὴ συνεξημάρτανον ἐν ταῖς ταραχαῖς, εἴων οἰκεῖν τὴν πόλιν, χρώμενοι τῇ εἰωθυίᾳ τοῦ δήμου πραότητι· ὧν ἡγεμὼν καὶ προστάτης ἦν Ἵππαρχος.
εὐθὺς δὲ τῷ ὑστέρῳ ἔτει ἐπὶ Τελεσίνου ἄρχοντος 5
ἐκυάμευσαν τοὺς ἐννέα ἄρχοντας κατὰ φυλὰς ἐκ τῶν

20. Κολλυτεύς: MS. κολυττευς. 23. συνεξημάρτανον: MS. συνεξαμαρτανον, H-L. συνεξαμαρτάνοιεν, after Poste; and so K-W², who also omit ἐν. 26. ὑστέρῳ: K-W. ὕστερον, against MS.

Journal des Savants, p. 203, finds confirmation in the present treatise for the view that this person was *not* the historian, who was later than Aristotle.) In that case, and supposing the sentence to be part of the quotation from Androtion and not an explanatory addition by Harpocration, it would show that Aristotle's work was publicly known in the generation immediately succeeding his own. There are, however, so many elements of doubt about the matter that it is unsafe to draw any positive conclusion.

20. Κολλυτεύς: Plutarch (*Nic.* 11), who also mentions Hipparchus as the first victim of ostracism, describes him as Χολαργεύς.

25. ἡγεμών: the reverse of the second Berlin fragment (*cf. Hermes* XV. 376) begins here. It consists of parts of twenty-five lines, ending with the word τριηρεῖς; but the remains are too small for any information of value to be extracted from them.

26. ἐπὶ Τελεσίνου ἄρχοντος: this will be in 487 B.C., one of the three years after 496 B.C. (the others being 486 and 481 B.C.) for which no archon's name appears in our lists.

27. ἐκυάμευσαν τοὺς ἐννέα ἄρχοντας κ.τ.λ.: this passage must be compared with the account of the system of election introduced by Solon (ch. 8, κληρωτὰς κ.τ.λ.). It appears that in this year (487 B.C.) the Athenians reverted, with some modification, to the system which Solon had established, and which had been abrogated by the establishment of the tyranny; that is, they appointed the archons by lot from a number of candidates who had been selected by the tribes in free election. The statement which follows, *οἱ δὲ πρότεροι πάντες ἦσαν αἱρετοί*, must apply to the period between the expulsion of the tyrants and the time now being spoken of, and it shows that Cleisthenes did not apply the use of the lot to the election of archons, but had them freely elected, presumably by the Ecclesia. We therefore have the

προκριθέντων ὑπὸ τῶν δημοτῶν πεντακοσίων τότε

28. *τῶν δημοτῶν πεντακοσίων*: H-L. *τοῦ δήμου πεντακοσιομεδίμνων*, after J. W. Headlam's *τοῦ δήμου ἐκ τῶν πεντακοσιομεδίμνων*; Weil, *πεντεκαιεικοστῷ ἔτει* for *πεντακοσιων τοις*. *τότε*: so Blass, K-W., H-L.; MS. *τοις*, which might conceivably stand, but is hardly probable.

following stages in the history of the method of election to this office: (1) prior to Draco, the archons were nominated by the Areopagus; (2) under the Draconian constitution they were elected by the ecclesia; (3) under the Solonian constitution, so far as it was not disturbed by internal troubles and revolutions, they were chosen by lot from forty candidates selected by the four tribes; (4) under the constitution of Cleisthenes (perhaps continuing the usage under the tyrants) they were directly elected by the people in the ecclesia; (5) after 487 B.C. they were appointed by lot from 100 (or 500, see below) candidates selected by the ten tribes; (6) at some later period (see ch. 8) the process of the lot was adopted also in the preliminary selection by the tribes.

One point remains to be settled, namely the number of candidates selected by the tribes under the arrangement of 487 B.C. It is here given as 500, *i.e.* fifty from each tribe; but on the other hand it is distinctly stated in ch. 8 that each tribe chose ten candidates, so that the total would be 100. It is true that Aristotle is there speaking of the practice in his own time, while here he is describing that of the fifth century; but it is not in the least likely that the number of persons nominated by each tribe was reduced. The tendency is more likely to have been the other way. It is more probable that for *πεντακοσίων* (*φ*′) we should read *ἑκατὸν* (*ρ*′), the confusion between the two numerals being very easy, and perhaps to be paralleled from Thuc. II. 7. Mr. J. W. Headlam proposes to read *ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ἐκ τῶν πεντακοσιομεδίμνων*, but the qualification is not in question here, and so extensive a departure from the MS. requires further justification.

It follows from the present passage that the polemarch Callimachus at Marathon was elected and not chosen by lot. This is the view which has always been preferable on grounds of common sense, and it is only the authority of Herodotus which has made it doubtful. As is stated by Aristotle just above, the polemarch was still the commander-in-chief, and the strategi were, technically at any rate, his subordinates. In this capacity he gave his vote last, just as is the practice in a modern council of war.

28. *ὑπὸ τῶν δημοτῶν*: this, if literally interpreted, is in contradiction with the passage in ch. 62, which says *αἱ δὲ κληρωταὶ ἀρχαὶ πρότερον μὲν ἦσαν αἱ μὲν μετ᾽ ἐννέα ἀρχόντων ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς ὅλης κληρούμεναι, αἱ δ᾽ ἐν Θησείῳ κληρούμεναι διῃροῦντο εἰς τοὺς δήμους*. This implies that the preliminary selection of the candidates for the archonship was made by the whole tribe, not by the separate demes. It is true that *δημόται*

μετὰ τὴν τυραννίδα πρῶτον, (οἱ δὲ πρότεροι πάντες ἦσαν αἱρετοί)· καὶ ὠστρακίσθη Μεγακλῆς Ἱππο*κράτους* Ἀλωπεκῆθεν. *ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν ἔτη γ̄ τοὺς τῶν* 6
τυράννων φίλους ὠστράκιζον, ὧν χάριν ὁ νόμος ἐτέθη, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τῷ τετάρτῳ ἔτει καὶ τῶν ἄλλων εἴ τις δοκοίη μείζων εἶναι μεθίσταντο· καὶ πρῶτος ὠστρακίσθη τῶν ἄπωθεν τῆς τυραννίδος Ξάνθιππος ὁ Ἀρίφρονος. ἔτει δὲ τρίτῳ μετὰ ταῦτα 7
Νικοδήμου *ἄρχοντος, ὡς ἐφάνη τὰ μέταλλα τὰ ἐν*

37. **Νικοδήμου**: MS. *νικομηδους*, which K-W. and H-L. retain; but the Berlin fragment has **Νικοδημου**, and this form is confirmed by Dionysius.

may simply stand for the members of the tribe, all of whom were necessarily members of a deme ; but it would be rather a misleading use in this connection. It may be that Aristotle has made a mistake, and that the *πεντακοσίων* discussed above is part of the same mistake ; for the demes did actually elect the 500 members of the *βουλή*, as appears from the continuation of the passage in ch. 62 just quoted. The fact which remains certain is that the use of the lot was, in some manner or another, introduced at this date for the election of the archons.

30. **Μεγακλῆς Ἱπποκράτους**: this would be the grandson of the Megacles who was the opponent of Pisistratus, and the nephew of Cleisthenes. It is consequently surprising to find him among the persons ostracised as friends of the tyrants. The banishment of a Megacles, who was the maternal grandfather of Alcibiades, is mentioned by Lysias (*Contr. Alc.* I. 39), but it has been supposed that this was the son of Cleisthenes, who bore the same name. An ostrakon has, however, been found bearing the name Μεγακλῆς [Ἱππο]κράτους Ἀλωπεκῆθεν (*Jahrb. d. Arch. Inst.* 1887, p. 161, *Classical Review*, V. 277), which is presumably to be referred to this occasion and confirms the statement of Aristotle.

36. **Ξάνθιππος ὁ Ἀρίφρονος** : this ostracism of Xanthippus is not elsewhere mentioned in literature, except in the extract from Heraclides quoted above, in the note on ch. 18, l. 9; but an ostrakon was found in the pre-Persian stratum of the Acropolis in 1886, bearing the words Ξάνθιππος Ἀρίφρονος, which has been taken to be a genuine remnant from the ostracism of Xanthippus (*ll. cc.* in last note). Like Aristides he must have returned at the time of the second Persian war, as he was archon in 479 B.C. and commanded the Athenians at Mycale and at the siege of Sestos.

37. **Νικοδήμου ἄρχοντος**: the dates are somewhat confusing here. The

Μαρωνείᾳ καὶ περιεγένετο τῇ πόλει τάλαντα ἑκατὸν

38, 39. Berl. Pap. apparently ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἑκατὸν τάλαντα, and τῇ πόλει for τῷ δήμῳ (Diels, *Berl. Acad.* 1885, K-W.).

notes of time given for the period between the Persian wars are these. After Marathon διαλιπόντες δύο ἔτη . . . τῷ ὑστέρῳ ἔτει comes the archonship of Telesinus (487 B.C.); these three years are summarised in the phrase ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν ἔτη γ̄, and then τῷ τετάρτῳ ἔτει (486 B.C.) is the ostracism of Xanthippus; ἔτει δὲ τρίτῳ μετὰ ταῦτα (484 B.C.) is the archonship of Nicodemus; ἐν τούτοις τοῖς χρόνοις Aristides was ostracised, and τετάρτῳ ἔτει he and all the other political exiles were recalled, in the archonship of Hypsichides, διὰ τὴν Ξέρξου στρατείαν, *i.e.* in 481 B.C. This seems plain and consistent enough; but there is the difficulty that the archonship of Nicodemus is placed by Clinton and others in 483 B.C., on the authority of Dionysius. It may be that the three archons Philocrates, Leostratus, and Nicodemus should be placed in the years 486-484 B.C., instead of 485-483 B.C.; but the Parian marble places Philocrates five years before Marathon, and so incidentally confirms Dionysius' date for Nicodemus. On the other hand it is possible that Aristotle was mistaken in the year of Nicodemus; for it is noticeable that Plutarch, who, like Aristotle, records that Aristides was recalled in view of the march of Xerxes upon Greece, says that he returned in the *third* year after his banishment (*Arist.* 8). If, then, Aristotle knew that the ostracism took place in the archonship of Nicodemus, but believed that archonship to fall in 484 B.C., this discrepancy is removed, and it is unnecessary to make any alteration in the received list of archons.

Bauer's calculation is rather different. He reckons ἐπὶ . . ἔτη γ̄ from the year of Hipparchus' banishment, thus 488 B.C. (Hipparchus), 487 B.C. (Megacles), 486 B.C. (unnamed friends of tyrants). Then τετάρτῳ ἔτει, *i.e.* 485 B.C., Xanthippus; ἔτει δὲ τρίτῳ (483 B.C.) Nicodemus. Aristides' banishment ἐν τούτοις τοῖς χρόνοις is then placed in 484 B.C., and the rest follows easily, Plutarch's version being put aside. The main difficulty here is the retrograde interpretation of ἐν τούτοις τοῖς χρόνοις, for as the ostracism of Aristides is taken as the basis of the calculation of the next date, it is hardly credible that Aristotle should intend to slip back a year from the date previously fixed, without mentioning it.

As regards the exact name of the archon in question, it must be noted that the MS. reads Νικομήδους, but on the other hand Dionysius calls him Nicodemus, and this reading is confirmed by the Berlin fragment of Aristotle. The testimony of Aristotle being thus doubtful the authority of Dionysius may turn the scale. Under these circumstances it does not appear that any good purpose would be served

ἐκ τῶν ἔργων, συμβουλευόντων τινῶν τῷ δήμῳ διανείμασθαι τὸ ἀργύριον, Θεμιστοκλῆς ἐκώλυσεν,

by leaving the name Νικομήδους in the text here, and Νικοδήμου has accordingly been substituted.

τὰ μέταλλα τὰ ἐν Μαρωνείᾳ: in Herodotus (VII. 144) and Plutarch (*Them.* 4) the mines are described as those of Laurium. Demosthenes (*Contr. Pantaen.* § 4, p. 967) refers to a Maroneia at which there were works (ἔργα) which seem to have been mines; and Harpocration (*s. v.* Μαρώνεια) states that this place was in Attica, and was distinct from the Maroneia in Thrace mentioned by the same orator (*Contr. Polycl.* § 20, p. 1213). Dr. Sandys also refers to Bekk. *Anecd.* (Lexica Segueriana), p. 279, Μαρώνεια· τόπος ἦν τῆς Ἀττικῆς, ὅπου τὰ μέταλλα εὑρέθη. There need therefore be no doubt that Maroneia in Attica was in the neighbourhood of Laurium, and that the mines referred to by Aristotle are the same as those mentioned by Herodotus and Plutarch. Mr. Richards (*Class. Rev.* V. 226) objects to ἐφάνη, on the ground that Xenophon (*de Vect.* IV. 2) speaks of the mines as of immemorial antiquity. But Xenophon does not specify Maroneia, which was presumably a newly discovered and exceptionally rich section of the mine district of Laurium.

38. τάλαντα ἑκατὸν κ.τ.λ.: this story is repeated by Polyaenus (*Strateg.* I. 30), who evidently took it from Aristotle. The details are different from, but not inconsistent with, those given by Herodotus. It is evident that Grote was right in holding, as against Boeckh, that it was not intended to distribute among the populace the whole sum derived from the mines. Herodotus states that the proposed distribution was to be at the rate of 10 drachmas a head, which would amount, according to Boeckh's calculation, to 33⅓ talents in all.

40. Θεμιστοκλῆς: this passage does not solve the disputed question as to the archonship of Themistocles. It is clear, however, that he was not archon at the time of the proposal to distribute the funds available from the silver mines, since that occurred in the archonship of Nicodemus, but that his guidance of the policy of his country in the direction of ship-building was effected in his capacity as a popular leader in the Ecclesia. Athenian policy was not directed by the archon or by any magistrate as such, but by the Ecclesia, and therefore ultimately by the leaders of the Ecclesia. On the other hand Thucydides expressly says that Themistocles was in office at the time when he began the fortification of the Piraeus (I. 93, ὑπῆρκτο δ' αὐτοῦ πρότερον ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκείνου ἀρχῆς ἧς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν Ἀθηναίοις ἦρξε). This does not *necessarily* mean that he was archon eponymus, but the use of ἐπί with the genitive, the almost invariable method of indicating the year, favours the belief that he was. It is moreover certain that he was archon (though not necessarily archon eponymus) at some

οὐ λέγων ὅ τι χρήσεται τοῖς χρήμασιν ἀλλὰ δανεῖσαι κελεύων τοῖς πλουσιωτάτοις Ἀθηναίων ἑκατὸν ἑκάστῳ τάλαντον, εἶτ' ἐὰν μὲν ἀρέσκῃ τὸ ἀνάλωμα τῆς πόλεως εἶναι τὴν δαπάνην, εἰ δὲ μή, κο-

44. *τὴν δαπάνην*: deleted by H-L. as a gloss, comparing Polyaenus (*l. c.*) *κἂν μὲν ἀρέσῃ τὸ πραχθησόμενον, τῇ πόλει τὸ ἀνάλωμα λογισθῆναι.*

period in his career, from the fact that he appears later as a member of the Areopagus (ch. 25, l. 15). It is therefore not improbable that he was archon eponymus at the time indicated by Thucydides. In that case it may be taken as certain that his year of office falls in 482 B.C., not in 481 B.C. (as Clinton puts it), both because we have another archon's name mentioned below for whom the latter year is required, and because it accords better with probability, since it seems likely that the work of fortifying the Piraeus was undertaken in connection with the building of the triremes, which was commenced in 483 B.C. At the same time the fact of his holding that office is only to a very limited extent a sign of appointment by the people to carry out his naval policy, since the final process of election to the archonship was at this time conducted by lot; and the words of Thucydides are consistent with his having held any magistracy, such, for instance, as that of *στρατηγός*, on whom the execution of such operations might naturally fall.

It may be added that the supposed archonship of Themistocles in 493 B.C. appears very problematical. It is not in the least likely that the same person would wish to be archon twice, when it brought no substantial advantages except a seat in the Areopagus. It is doubtful even if re-election was legal; it certainly was not so in later times, *cf.* ch. 62, l. 23. Nor is it likely that the naval policy of Themistocles, indicated by the fortification of the Piraeus, began so far back as that date. It appears more natural to connect it closely with the building of the fleet in 483 B.C. Further, it is probable that the archons had to be not less than thirty years old, as was certainly the case in the time of Draco (ch. 4, l. 18). If Themistocles was archon in 493 B.C. he must have been born not later than 523 B.C., in which case he would have been at least thirty-three at the time of Marathon, and could hardly be called *νέος*, as he is by Plutarch (*Them.* 3). Moreover Plutarch tells us that he was sixty-five at his death, which would therefore on this theory fall not later than 458 B.C. But, as appears from ch. 25 below, if the story there given be accepted, his flight to Persia cannot have occurred before 460 B.C., and it is probable that he lived there some years before his death. These considerations cumulatively make an archonship in 493 B.C. improbable. It rests on the authority, which is in itself good, of Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.* VI. 34), but there is nothing to prove that he is speaking of the same Themistocles. The father's name is

μίσασθαι τὰ χρήματα παρὰ τῶν δανεισαμένων. λαβὼν δ' ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐνα[υ]πηγήσατο τριήρεις ἑκατόν, ἑκάστου ναυπηγουμένου τῶν ἑκατὸν μίαν, αἷς ἐναυμάχησαν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους. ὠστρακίσθη δ' ἐν τούτοις τοῖς καιροῖς Ἀριστείδης ὁ Λυσιμάχου. τετάρτῳ δ' ἔτει κατεδέξαντο πάντας 8
τοὺς ὠστρακισμένους, ἄρχοντος Ὑψιχίδου, διὰ τὴν Ξέρξου στρατείαν· καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ὥρισαν τοῖς ὀστρακιζομένοις ἐντὸς Γεραιστοῦ καὶ Σκυλλαίου κατοικεῖν ἢ ἀτίμους εἶναι καθάπαξ.

50. *τετάρτῳ*: K-W.[2] alter to *τρίτῳ*. 51. *Ὑψιχίδου*: the reading is somewhat doubtful. After the *ψ* there appears to be an erasure of two or three letters, over which an *ι* has been written as a correction. *Ὑψηχίδας* occurs as a Spartan name in Plut. *Sol.* 10, and H-L. read *Ὑψηχίδου* here. It is possible to read an *η* in the original writing of the MS., but this leaves two or three strokes unexplained; and the *ι* of the correction is plain. 52. *στρατείαν*: MS. *στρατιαν*: *cf.* Meisterhans, p. 43.

not mentioned, and it may be another person of the same name, or else Dionysius has on this occasion made a mistake.

51. *ἄρχοντος Ὑψιχίδου*: the name Hypsichides (if this is the correct reading of it) is otherwise unknown. It is clear from the words which follow that the year is 481 B.C. Plutarch (*Arist.* 8) says that Aristides and the other exiles were recalled while Xerxes was on his march through Thessaly and Boeotia. This would be in the spring of 480 B.C., and therefore in the year of the archon who entered office in July of 481 B.C.; Calliades, in whose archonship Salamis was fought, succeeded to the post in July of 480 B.C.

From this passage it appears that Herodotus must have been wrong if he intended to represent Aristides as still under sentence of ostracism at the time of the battle of Salamis. The time, however, between his recall and the battle was so short that the mistake, if it be one, is natural; but it is not certain that the participle *ἐξωστρακισμένος* means more than that he had been ostracised, without necessarily implying that he still was so.

53. *ἐντὸς Γεραιστοῦ καὶ Σκυλλαίου*: presumably these places, which stand at the extreme south of Euboea and east of Argolis respectively, mark the eastern and western limits within which the ostracised person was free to live, and if so he was confined within very narrow boundaries. It is not certain, however, that the reading is right. Mr. Wyse has conjectured *ἐκτός* for *ἐντός*, and this conjecture (as has been pointed out by Dr. Sandys) appears to be confirmed by the Lex. Rhet. Can-

23. Τότε μὲν οὖν μέχρι τούτου προῆλθεν ἡ πόλις ἅμα τῇ δημοκρατίᾳ κατὰ μικρὸν αὐξανομένη· μετὰ δὲ τὰ Μηδικὰ πάλιν ἴσχυσεν ἡ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλὴ καὶ διῴκει τὴν πόλιν, οὐδενὶ δόγματι λαβοῦσα τὴν ἡγ[εμο]νίαν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι τῆς περὶ

XXIII. 1. τότε: H-L. τό, after Poste.

tabrig. *s.v.* ὀστρακισμοῦ τρόπος, which refers to this law with the phrase μὴ ἐπιβαίνοντα ἐντὸς Γεραιστοῦ. It is of course certain that in later times ostracised persons were not confined within these limits, since we find the ostracised Themistocles living in Argos (Thuc. I. 135) and the ostracised Hyperbolus in Samos (Thuc. VIII. 73); the appearance of Cimon at Tanagra (Plut. *Cim.* 17, *Per.* 10) cannot be pressed, as the circumstances were exceptional. On the other hand, the point of the present passages disappears if ἐκτός be read. Plutarch says that the principal reason for the recall of the exiles before the second Persian invasion was the fear that Aristides might attach himself to Xerxes and carry with him a considerable party in Athens; and it would therefore be reasonable enough to pass a regulation which would obviate the danger of a banished citizen entering into communication with Persia. As regards Themistocles and Hyperbolus more than one explanation is possible; either the regulation may not have been strictly observed (as would very likely be the case when the danger from Persia was over), or an ostracised person who did not expect to be recalled might prefer to accept ἀτιμία and live where he chose. K-W. and H-L. retain ἐντός, as also do Kaibel and Kiessling and Poland in their translations. Ferrini, Zuretti, and Reinach accept ἐκτός.

XXIII. 3. πάλιν ἴσχυσεν ἡ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλή: *cf. Pol.* VIII. (V.) 4, p. 1304^a 20, ἡ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλὴ εὐδοκιμήσασα ἐν τοῖς Μηδικοῖς ἔδοξε συντονωτέραν ποιῆσαι τὴν πολιτείαν. In the same sentence the development of the democracy is also attributed to the triumph of the ναυτικὸς ὄχλος at Salamis. The two statements are not inconsistent. The first was an immediate result, the second the consequence of a gradual but sure development, which started from the same event.

5. διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι κ.τ.λ.: Plutarch tells this story (*Themist.* 10), quoting Aristotle as his authority, though he adds that Cleidemus reported the money in question to have been produced by a device of Themistocles (Rose, *Frag.* 360). Rose also gives (as *Frag.* 361) a quotation from Aelian, who refers to Aristotle for a story about a dog belonging to Xanthippus which swam with the escaping Athenians to Salamis. Plutarch gives the same story, but if the authority is Aristotle it must be in some other of his works, probably one on natural history.

Σαλαμῖνα ναυμαχίας αἰτία. τῶν γὰρ στρατηγῶν
ἐξαπορησάντων τοῖς πράγμασι καὶ κηρυξάντων
σῴζειν ἕκαστον ἑαυτόν, πορίσασα δραχμὰς ἑκάστῳ
ὀκτὼ διέδωκε καὶ ἐνεβίβασεν εἰς τὰς ναῦς. διὰ 2
ταύτην δὴ τὴν αἰτίαν παρεχώρουν αὐτῇ τῷ ἀξιώματι,
καὶ ἐπολιτεύθησαν Ἀθηναῖοι καλῶς καὶ κατὰ τούτους τοὺς καιρούς. συνέβη γὰρ αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὸν
χρόνον τοῦτον τά τε εἰς τὸν πόλεμον ἀσκῆσαι καὶ
παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν εὐδοκιμῆσαι καὶ τὴν τῆς θαλάττης ἡγεμονίαν λαβεῖν ἀκόντων τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων.
ἦσαν δὲ προστάται τοῦ δήμου κατὰ τούτους τοὺς 3
καιροὺς Ἀριστείδης ὁ Λυσιμάχου καὶ Θεμιστοκλῆς
ὁ Νεοκλέους, ὁ μὲν τὰ πολέμια ἀσκῶν, ὁ δὲ τὰ
πολιτικὰ δεινὸς εἶναι ⟨δοκῶν⟩ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ τῶν
καθ' ἑαυτὸν διαφέρειν· διὸ καὶ ἐχρῶντο τῷ μὲν
στρατηγῷ, τῷ δὲ συμβούλῳ. τὴν μὲν οὖν τῶν 4

8. *σῴζειν*: MS. *σωζειν*: *cf.* Meisterhans, p. 142. 10. *αὐτῇ*: MS. *αυτην*. *αὐτῆς* Blass, H-L., *αὐτῆς ἀξιώματι* (omitting *τῷ*) Rutherford, *αὐτῇ τοῦ ἀξιώματος* J. E. B. Mayor, K-W. *-ην* for *-ηι* is a common corruption in this MS., but if that is not sufficient, Blass' correction is the simplest, as involving least departure from the MS. 11. *καί*: probably merely a copyist's mistake, as there is no apparent reason for the emphasis which it gives to the clause. K-W. bracket it; H-L. suggest a possible reference to ch. 33, l. 17, but it is hardly probable. 12. *κατά*: apparently *περί* is written above as a correction. K-W. bracket *κατὰ . . . τοῦτον*. 15. *ἀκόντων*: H-L. *εἰκόντων*, after Naber; J. B. Mayor and Gennadios *ἑκόντων*; but the Lacedaemonians were surely *not* willing (Thuc. I. 95). 18. *πολέμια*: Blass, Richards, Thompson *πολεμικά*, but Thuc. I. 18 (*εὖ παρεσκευάσαντο τὰ πολέμια*) and IV. 80 (*ἀξιοῦσιν ἐν τοῖς πολεμίοις γεγενῆσθαι σφίσιν ἄριστοι*) seem to justify the retention of the MS. reading. 19. *πολιτικά*:. MS. *πολεμικα*, evidently a clerical blunder due to *πολέμια* which precedes. *δοκῶν*: some such supplement is necessary. H-L. and K-W.[2] alter *ἀσκῶν* in l. 18 to *δοκῶν*, after Richards, Thompson, Kontos, which gives a very awkward order. Possibly *δοκῶν ἀσκεῖν* for *ἀσκῶν* gives an easier explanation of the corruption.

20, 21. *τῷ μὲν στρατηγῷ, τῷ δὲ συμβούλῳ*: Mr. W. L. Newman (*Class. Rev.* V. 161) refers to *Pol.* VIII. (V.) 9, p. 1309ᵇ 1–8, where the different qualities of the general and the statesman are discussed, evidently with reference to Themistocles and Aristides.

τειχῶν ἀνοικοδόμησιν κοινῇ διῴκησαν, καίπερ διαφερόμενοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους· ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν ἀπόστασιν τὴν τῶν Ἰώνων ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων συμμαχίας Ἀριστείδης ἦν ὁ προτρέψας, τηρήσας τοὺς Λάκωνας διαβεβλημένους διὰ Παυσανίαν. διὸ καὶ τοὺς φόρους οὗτος ἦν ὁ τάξας ταῖς πόλεσιν τοὺς πρώτους ἔτει τρίτῳ μετὰ τὴν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχίαν ἐπὶ Τιμοσθένους ἄρχοντος, καὶ τοὺς ὅρκους ὤμοσεν τοῖς Ἴωσιν ὥστε τὸν αὐτὸν ἐχθρὸν εἶναι καὶ φίλον, ἐφ᾽ οἷς καὶ τοὺς μύδρους ἐν τῷ πελάγει καθεῖσαν. [Col. 10.]

24. *Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα θαρρούσης ἤδη τῆς πόλεως*

22. *ἀνοικοδόμησιν*: MS. *ανωικοδομησιν*. 24. *ἀπὸ τῆς . . . συμμαχίας*: so also Blass, H-L., K-W., Ferrini; MS. *και την . . . συμμαχιαν*. 28. *μετά*: MS. at first *δια*, but corrected.

24. *ἀπὸ τῆς . . . συμμαχίας*: this alteration of the MS. reading appears necessary in the interests of the sense of the passage. There is no sign of an alliance having been concluded by Athens with Sparta when the latter was in bad repute because of the misconduct of Pausanias, which is the only sense that the MS. reading can bear.

29. *ἐπὶ Τιμοσθένους ἄρχοντος*: the list of archons, derived from Dionysius and elsewhere, is complete from 480 to 321 B.C., and the names mentioned by Aristotle only confirm it. The mention of this date (478 B.C.) fixes the organisation of the Confederacy of Delos two years higher than that usually assigned. This is in accordance with Dem. *Phil.* III. § 23, p. 116, *προστάται μὲν ὑμεῖς ἑβδομήκοντ᾽ ἔτη καὶ τρία τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐγένεσθε* (*i.e.* 478–405 B.C.). The later dating apparently rests on the authority of Ephorus. Thucydides (I. 94–96) gives no date, but his narrative is quite in accordance with that named by Aristotle.

τοὺς ὅρκους ὤμοσεν τοῖς Ἴωσιν: this is not the same treaty as that mentioned by Herodotus (IX. 106), the latter having taken place in 479 B.C., immediately after Mycale, when Xanthippus, and not Aristides, was in command of the Athenian forces. Aristides renewed the treaty at the request of the Ionians at the time of which Thucydides speaks (I. 95), *φοιτῶντες πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἠξίουν αὐτοὺς ἡγεμόνας σφῶν γενέσθαι κατὰ τὸ ξυγγενές*. Plutarch also (*Arist.* 25) mentions the ceremony of casting iron into the sea on this occasion, *ὁ δ᾽ Ἀριστείδης ὥρκισε τοὺς Ἕλληνας καὶ ὤμοσεν ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἀθηναίων, μύδρους ἐμβαλὼν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀραῖς εἰς τὴν θάλατταν.*

καὶ χρημάτων ἠθροισμένων πολλῶν, συνεβούλευεν
ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῆς ἡγεμονίας καὶ καταβάντας ἐκ
τῶν ἀγρῶν οἰκεῖν ἐν τῷ ἄστει· τροφὴν γὰρ ἔσεσθαι
πᾶσι, τοῖς μὲν στρατευομένοις, τοῖς δὲ φρουροῦσι,
τοῖς δὲ τὰ κοινὰ πράττουσι, εἶθ' οὕτω κατασχήσειν
τὴν ἡγεμονίαν. πεισθέντες δὲ ταῦτα καὶ λαβόντες 2
τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῖς τε συμμάχοις δεσποτικωτέρως
ἐχρῶντο πλὴν Χίων καὶ Λεσβίων καὶ Σαμίων· τού-
τους δὲ φύλακας εἶχον τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἐῶντες τάς τε
πολιτείας παρ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ἄρχειν ὧν ἔτυχον ἄρχοντες.
κατέστησαν δὲ καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς εὐπορίαν τροφῆς, 3
ὥσπερ Ἀριστείδης εἰσηγήσατο. συνέβαινεν γὰρ

XXIV. 2. *ἠθροισμένων πολλῶν*: at first written *πολλῶν ἠθροισμένων*, but a *β* has been written above the former word and an *α* above the latter, to indicate the true order. *ἀθροιζομένων* K-W., which seems an unnecessary departure from the MS. 11. K-W. insert *τάς* before *παρ' αὐτοῖς*, but the MS. reading appears quite possible. After *ἄρχοντες* K-W. add *αὐτοῖς ἐπιτρέποντες καί*, and mark a lacuna, in which they think the cleruchi were mentioned.

XXIV. 2. *συνεβούλευεν κ.τ.λ.*: this counsel to the people to come in from the country, in order to secure the control, first of Athens, and thereby of the allies of Athens, is what one would rather have expected to come from Themistocles. At the same time Aristides is called *προστάτης τοῦ δήμου* just above, and he was never the leader of the aristocratical party. Moreover his conduct in reference to the Confederacy of Delos shows that the imperial idea was strong in him, and, while he would probably not have been a party to any unjust treatment of the allies, he no doubt wished to see Athens in possession of the *ἡγεμονία* of Greece by sea; and Plutarch (*Arist.* 25) quotes Theophrastus as saying that Aristides *ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς πολλὰ πρᾶξαι πρὸς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τῆς πατρίδος ὡς συχνῆς ἀδικίας δεομένης*. The multiplication of paid offices in the state is a first stage in that process of paying the democracy of Athens which was carried to its full extent under Pericles, and which really made the poorer classes in the community, the democracy in the narrower sense of the term, the dominant power in the state.

3. *ἡγεμονίας*: *cf. Pol.* VIII. (V.) 4, p. 1304ª 22, *ὁ ναυτικὸς ὄχλος γενόμενος αἴτιος . . . τῆς ἡγεμονίας διὰ τὴν κατὰ θάλατταν δύναμιν τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἰσχυροτέραν ἐποίησεν.*

ἀπὸ τῶν φόρων καὶ τῶν τελῶν καὶ τῶν συμμάχων πλείους ἢ δισμυρίους ἄνδρας τρέφεσθαι. δικασταὶ μὲν γὰρ ἦ[σα]ν ἑξακισχίλιοι, τοξόται δ' ἑξακόσιοι καὶ χίλιοι, καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἱππεῖς χίλιοι καὶ διακόσιοι, βουλὴ δὲ πεντακόσιοι, καὶ φρουροὶ νεωρίων πεντακόσιοι, καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἐν τῇ πόλει φρουροὶ ν̄, ἀρχαὶ δ' ἔνδημοι μὲν εἰς ἑπτακοσίους ἄνδρας, ὑπερόριοι δ' εἰς ἑπτακοσίους· πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἐπεὶ συνεστήσαντο τὸν πόλεμον ὕστερον ὁπλῖται μὲν δισχίλιοι καὶ πεντακόσιοι, νῆες δὲ φρουρίδες εἴκοσι, ἄλλαι δὲ νῆες αἱ τοὺς φόρους

14. φόρων: the first two letters have been blotted in the MS., and are rewritten above; H-L. εἰσφορῶν. 18. καί: K-W. bracket, but K-W². transfer the bracket to τῇ in next line. 20. ἔνδημοι μέν: in the MS. the word ἦσαν follows, but has been cancelled by a row of dots above it. 21. ἑπτακοσίους: K-W. consider this an erroneous repetition from the preceding line. 23. ὁπλῖται: MS. οπλειται.

14. It is not clear how τῶν συμμάχων differs from τῶν φόρων, as the only way in which the allies gave direct financial assistance to Athens, and so provided support for the Athenian populace, was by the φόρος. K-W. suggest that καὶ τῶν συμμάχων should be expunged; H-L. read εἰσφορῶν for φόρων, which is a simpler correction.

15. πλείους ἢ δισμυρίους: the numbers given (allowing 4000 men for the twenty guard-ships, at the usual rate of 200 men to each ship) amount in all to 19,750 persons, exclusive of the orphans and other persons mentioned at the end of the list, of whom no estimate is given. Aristotle's statement is therefore fully justified. This list does not, however, apply to the times of Aristides, when, for instance, the dicasts were not paid, but to the result of the policy which Aristides initiated. H-L. consider the whole passage, to the end of the chapter, as spurious.

20. ἀρχαὶ δ' ἔνδημοι κ.τ.λ.: it has been generally believed, and is stated by Boeckh, Schömann, and others, that the higher magistrates at Athens were unpaid. But it does not appear that this rests on any definite authority, and two or three passages in this treatise are inconsistent with that view. *Cf.* ch. 62.

21. ὑπερόριοι: Prof. Mayor (*Class. Rev.* V. 121) cites Aesch. *in Timarch.* c. 21, § 47, μηδὲ ἀρχὴν ἀρχέτω μηδεμίαν, μήτε ἔνδημον μήτε ὑπερόριον.

24. αἱ τοὺς φόρους ἄγουσαι: Boeckh (*Staatsh*³. I. 218, II. 345) considers that the subject states brought their tributes to Athens themselves at

ἄγουσαι τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κυάμου δισχιλίους ἄνδρας, ἔτι δὲ πρυτανεῖον καὶ ὀρφανοὶ καὶ δεσμωτῶν φύλακες· ἅπασι γὰρ τούτοις ἀπὸ τῶν κοινῶν ἡ διοίκησις ἦν.

25. Ἡ *μὲν οὖν τροφὴ τῷ δήμῳ διὰ τούτων ἐγίγνετο. ἔτη δὲ ἑπτὰ καὶ δέκα μάλιστα μετὰ τὰ* Μηδικὰ *διέμεινεν ἡ πολιτεία προεστώτων τῶν* Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν, *καίπερ ὑποφερομένη κατὰ μικρόν. αὐξανομένου δὲ τοῦ πλήθους γενόμενος τοῦ δήμου*
[Col. 11.] *προστάτης* Ἐφιάλτης *ὁ* Σοφωνίδου, *καὶ δοκῶν*

27. *διοίκησις*: H-L. *διασίτησις*. XXV. 2. *ἐγίγνετο*: MS. *εγινετο*. 6. *καί*: K-W. and H-L. suspect that this word should be deleted.

the time of the Dionysia in the city, and that the *ἀργυρολόγοι* were only sent to collect special sums, such as arrears or fines. From this passage of Aristotle it appears that this was not always the case, and that the tribute was collected by certain vessels appointed for the purpose. This statement, however, relates to the arrangements in time of war, when it would clearly not be safe for the allied states to be sending their contributions separately and without protection; and as regards times of peace it is quite likely that Boeckh's view is correct. It appears that the ships charged with the duty in time of war were ten in number (according to the usual estimate of a trireme's crew), two for each of the five tribute-districts of the Athenian empire, and were manned by 2000 persons appointed by lot. The construction of *τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κυάμου δισχιλίους ἄνδρας* is not clear, but apparently a suitable word must be supplied from *ἄγουσαι* to govern it, or, as Rutherford suggests, *συλλέγουσαι* has fallen out before *ἄγουσαι*. K-W. mark a lacuna between *ἄγουσαι* and *τούς*. Blass (followed by Ferrini) substitutes *φρουρούς* for *φόρους*, but it does not appear in what the duty of such a squadron consisted. H-L. suggest *μισθοφόρους*.

26. *πρυτανεῖον*: this presumably stands for all the persons who for various reasons were maintained at the public expense in the Prytaneum.

XXV. 2. *ἔτη δὲ ἑπτὰ καὶ δέκα μάλιστα μετὰ τὰ Μηδικά*: this presumably covers the whole period up to the archonship of Conon, mentioned just below, which belongs to the year 462 B.C. In that case Aristotle reckons the end of the Persian war as 478 B.C., the date of the Confederacy of Delos.

6. *Σοφωνίδου*: the second letter appears to have been written first as *ω*, but is corrected to *ο*, which form is confirmed by Aelian (*Var. Hist.* II. 43, III. 17, XI. 9). With this word the tenth column of the MS. breaks off, the rest of the column and the whole of another

Μαρωνείᾳ καὶ περιεγένετο τῇ πόλει τάλαντα ἑκατὸν

38, 39. Berl. Pap. apparently ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἑκατὸν τάλαντα, and τῇ πόλει for τῷ δήμῳ (Diels, *Berl. Acad.* 1885, K-W.).

notes of time given for the period between the Persian wars are these. After Marathon διαλιπόντες δύο ἔτη . . . τῷ ὑστέρῳ ἔτει comes the archonship of Telesinus (487 B.C.); these three years are summarised in the phrase ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν ἔτη γ̄, and then τῷ τετάρτῳ ἔτει (486 B.C.) is the ostracism of Xanthippus; ἔτει δὲ τρίτῳ μετὰ ταῦτα (484 B.C.) is the archonship of Nicodemus; ἐν τούτοις τοῖς χρόνοις Aristides was ostracised, and τετάρτῳ ἔτει he and all the other political exiles were recalled, in the archonship of Hypsichides, διὰ τὴν Ξέρξου στρατείαν, *i.e.* in 481 B.C. This seems plain and consistent enough; but there is the difficulty that the archonship of Nicodemus is placed by Clinton and others in 483 B.C., on the authority of Dionysius. It may be that the three archons Philocrates, Leostratus, and Nicodemus should be placed in the years 486-484 B.C., instead of 485-483 B.C.; but the Parian marble places Philocrates five years before Marathon, and so incidentally confirms Dionysius' date for Nicodemus. On the other hand it is possible that Aristotle was mistaken in the year of Nicodemus; for it is noticeable that Plutarch, who, like Aristotle, records that Aristides was recalled in view of the march of Xerxes upon Greece, says that he returned in the *third* year after his banishment (*Arist.* 8). If, then, Aristotle knew that the ostracism took place in the archonship of Nicodemus, but believed that archonship to fall in 484 B.C., this discrepancy is removed, and it is unnecessary to make any alteration in the received list of archons.

Bauer's calculation is rather different. He reckons ἐπὶ .. ἔτη γ̄ from the year of Hipparchus' banishment, thus 488 B.C. (Hipparchus), 487 B.C. (Megacles), 486 B.C. (unnamed friends of tyrants). Then τετάρτῳ ἔτει, *i.e.* 485 B.C., Xanthippus; ἔτει δὲ τρίτῳ (483 B.C.) Nicodemus. Aristides' banishment ἐν τούτοις τοῖς χρόνοις is then placed in 484 B.C., and the rest follows easily, Plutarch's version being put aside. The main difficulty here is the retrograde interpretation of ἐν τούτοις τοῖς χρόνοις, for as the ostracism of Aristides is taken as the basis of the calculation of the next date, it is hardly credible that Aristotle should intend to slip back a year from the date previously fixed, without mentioning it.

As regards the exact name of the archon in question, it must be noted that the MS. reads Νικομήδους, but on the other hand Dionysius calls him Nicodemus, and this reading is confirmed by the Berlin fragment of Aristotle. The testimony of Aristotle being thus doubtful the authority of Dionysius may turn the scale. Under these circumstances it does not appear that any good purpose would be served

Θεμιστοκλέους, ὃς ἦν μὲν τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν, ἔμελλε

Persia about 466 B.C.; the latter date being fixed by the statement of Thucydides that Themistocles, during his flight, narrowly escaped capture by the Athenian fleet besieging Naxos. The siege of Naxos preceded the battle of the Eurymedon, which is fixed with practical certainty for 466 B.C. Xerxes died in 465 B.C., and Thucydides states that Themistocles on his arrival in Persia found Artaxerxes *νεωστὶ βασιλεύοντα*. The present passage, on the other hand, states that he was still in Athens in 462 B.C. He was then expecting a trial on the charge of Medism. This cannot be the charge which was made after the discovery of his complicity with Pausanias, since that took place while he was living in banishment; but if the trial ever took place at all, and was not altogether averted by his proceedings against the Areopagus, it must be the earlier one, in which he secured an acquittal (Diod. XI. 54, *cf.* Grote, ed. 1870, vol. V. p. 136). His ostracism cannot then well have occurred before 461 B.C., and his flight to Persia may be placed approximately in 460 B.C. Artaxerxes would then have been on the throne about five years, which is not inconsistent with Thucydides' phrase *νεωστὶ βασιλεύοντα*. The fifth year of a king who ruled for forty might well be spoken of as in the beginning of the reign. But the difficulty raised by Thucydides' reference to the siege of Naxos is not so easy to explain, and we are practically reduced to two alternatives. Either the story of Themistocles' having been nearly carried into the middle of the Athenians is wrongly attached to the siege of Naxos, and should be connected instead with some other operations about 460 B.C.; or two inconsistent accounts of the later years of Themistocles were current, of which one was adopted by Thucydides, the other by Aristotle, a hundred years later. In favour of the date of Thucydides is the fact that he was writing so much nearer to the events recorded, and that it appears to harmonise better with the chronology of the later historians and chronologists. On the other hand, Aristotle's story is detailed and characteristic, and it is at least as difficult to understand how it became current if it is false, as to explain how it was omitted by other authorities if it is true. Bauer, who makes the statement of Aristotle as to Themistocles' presence in Athens in 462 B.C. the corner-stone for the chronology of the period, also accepts Thucydides' reference to the siege of Naxos. The result is a general lowering of the accepted dates, placing the siege of Naxos and battle of Eurymedon in 460 B.C., the beginning of the Messenian revolt and the defeat of the Athenians at Drabescus in 459 B.C., the Athenian expedition to Egypt in 456 B.C., its failure and the end of the Messenian revolt in 450 B.C., Cimon's expedition to Cyprus and the death of Themistocles in 448 B.C. The contrary indications in Diodorus, Eusebius, &c., are rejected as due to a single false authority, probably Ephorus. There is not space to

οὐ λέγων ὅ τι χρήσεται τοῖς χρήμασιν ἀλλὰ δανεῖσαι κελεύων τοῖς πλουσιωτάτοις Ἀθηναίων ἑκατὸν ἑκάστῳ τάλαντον, εἶτ' ἐὰν μὲν ἀρέσκῃ τὸ ἀνάλωμα τῆς πόλεως εἶναι τὴν δαπάνην, εἰ δὲ μή, κο-

44. *τὴν δαπάνην*: deleted by H-L. as a gloss, comparing Polyaenus (*l. c.*) *κἂν μὲν ἀρέσῃ τὸ πραχθησόμενον, τῇ πόλει τὸ ἀνάλωμα λογισθῆναι.*

period in his career, from the fact that he appears later as a member of the Areopagus (ch. 25, l. 15). It is therefore not improbable that he was archon eponymus at the time indicated by Thucydides. In that case it may be taken as certain that his year of office falls in 482 B.C., not in 481 B.C. (as Clinton puts it), both because we have another archon's name mentioned below for whom the latter year is required, and because it accords better with probability, since it seems likely that the work of fortifying the Piraeus was undertaken in connection with the building of the triremes, which was commenced in 483 B.C. At the same time the fact of his holding that office is only to a very limited extent a sign of appointment by the people to carry out his naval policy, since the final process of election to the archonship was at this time conducted by lot; and the words of Thucydides are consistent with his having held any magistracy, such, for instance, as that of *στρατηγός*, on whom the execution of such operations might naturally fall.

It may be added that the supposed archonship of Themistocles in 493 B.C. appears very problematical. It is not in the least likely that the same person would wish to be archon twice, when it brought no substantial advantages except a seat in the Areopagus. It is doubtful even if re-election was legal; it certainly was not so in later times, *cf.* ch. 62, l. 23. Nor is it likely that the naval policy of Themistocles, indicated by the fortification of the Piraeus, began so far back as that date. It appears more natural to connect it closely with the building of the fleet in 483 B.C. Further, it is probable that the archons had to be not less than thirty years old, as was certainly the case in the time of Draco (ch. 4, l. 18). If Themistocles was archon in 493 B.C. he must have been born not later than 523 B.C., in which case he would have been at least thirty-three at the time of Marathon, and could hardly be called *νέος*, as he is by Plutarch (*Them.* 3). Moreover Plutarch tells us that he was sixty-five at his death, which would therefore on this theory fall not later than 458 B.C. But, as appears from ch. 25 below, if the story there given be accepted, his flight to Persia cannot have occurred before 460 B.C., and it is probable that he lived there some years before his death. These considerations cumulatively make an archonship in 493 B.C. improbable. It rests on the authority, which is in itself good, of Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.* VI. 34), but there is nothing to prove that he is speaking of the same Themistocles. The father's name is

μένους ἐπὶ καταλύσει τῆς πολιτείας. ἀγαγὼν δὲ τοὺς ἀφαιρεθέντας τῆς βουλῆς οὗ διέτριβεν ὁ Ἐφιάλτης, ἵνα δείξῃ τ[οὺ]ς ἀθροιζομένους, διελέγετο μετὰ σπουδῆς αὐτοῖς. ὁ δ' Ἐφιάλτης ὡς 4
εἶδεν καταπλαγεὶς καθίζει μονοχίτων ἐπὶ τὸν βωμόν. θαυμασάντων δὲ πάντων τὸ γεγον[ὸς] καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα συναθροισθείσης τῆς βουλῆς τῶν πεντακοσίων κατηγόρουν τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν ὅ τ' Ἐφιάλτης καὶ ⟨ὁ⟩ Θεμιστοκλῆς, καὶ πάλιν ἐν τῷ δήμῳ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, ἕως περιείλοντο αὐτῶν τὴν δύναμιν. καὶ ἀνῃρέθη δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἐφιάλτης δολοφονηθεὶς μετ' οὐ πολὺν χρόνον δι' Ἀριστοδίκου [τ]οῦ Ταναγραίου. ἡ μὲν οὖν τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν βουλὴ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ἀπεστερήθη τῆς ἐπιμελείας.

26. Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα συνέβαινεν ἀνίεσθαι μᾶλλον τὴν πολιτείαν διὰ τοὺς προθύμως δημαγωγοῦντας. κατὰ γὰρ τοὺς καιροὺς τούτους συνέπεσε μηδ'

21. ἀφαιρεθέντας: H-L. ἐφαιρεθέντας, K-W. αἱρεθέντας (suggested in 1st ed.), Poland ἐξαιρεθέντας, Richards αἱρεθέντας ὑπό. οὗ: H-L. οἷ. 28. ὁ: added by K-W., Kontos, H-L. 29. περιείλοντο: MS. περειλοντο, H-L. παρείλοντο. 30. K-W. suppose a hiatus after the first καί, καὶ ⟨ὁ μὲν Θεμιστοκλῆς . . . .⟩. H-L. omit it, after J. B. Mayor and Blass. XXVI. 1. ἀνίεσθαι: MS. ανειεσθαι.

21. τοὺς ἀφαιρεθέντας τῆς βουλῆς: this must be taken in the unusual sense of 'the persons selected for the purpose by the Areopagus.' Mr. W. L. Newman (*Classical Review*, V. 164) quotes in illustration Arist. *H. A.* VI. 22, 576ᵇ 23, ὥρα δ' οὐκ ἀφαιρεῖται οὐδεμία τεταγμένη τοῦ ὀχεύεσθαι καὶ ὀχεύειν. Themistocles undertook to lead a deputation from the Areopagus to the house of Ephialtes, in order to show them the conspirators assembled there; but on arriving near the place he let himself be seen talking ostentatiously with them, and Ephialtes, who had been previously warned, made his escape to sanctuary. It is possible we should read αἱρεθέντας, and this is adopted by K-W.

31. δι' Ἀριστοδίκου τοῦ Ταναγραίου: this statement is quoted by Plutarch (*Pericl.* 10) as from Aristotle, Ἐφιάλτην μὲν οὖν . . . ἐπιβουλεύσαντες οἱ ἐχθροὶ δι' Ἀριστοδίκου τοῦ Ταναγραίου κρυφαίως ἀνεῖλον, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης εἴρηκεν (Rose, *Frag.* 367).

23. Τότε μὲν οὖν μέχρι τούτου προῆλθεν ἡ πόλις ἅμα τῇ δημοκρατίᾳ κατὰ μικρὸν αὐξανομένη· μετὰ δὲ τὰ Μηδικὰ πάλιν ἴσχυσεν ἡ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλὴ καὶ διῴκει τὴν πόλιν, οὐδενὶ δόγματι λαβοῦσα τὴν ἡγ[εμο]νίαν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι τῆς περὶ

XXIII. 1. *τότε*: H-L. *τό*, after Poste.

tabrig. *s.v.* *ὀστρακισμοῦ τρόπος*, which refers to this law with the phrase *μὴ ἐπιβαίνοντα ἐντὸς Γεραιστοῦ*. It is of course certain that in later times ostracised persons were not confined within these limits, since we find the ostracised Themistocles living in Argos (Thuc. I. 135) and the ostracised Hyperbolus in Samos (Thuc. VIII. 73); the appearance of Cimon at Tanagra (Plut. *Cim.* 17, *Per.* 10) cannot be pressed, as the circumstances were exceptional. On the other hand, the point of the present passages disappears if *ἐκτός* be read. Plutarch says that the principal reason for the recall of the exiles before the second Persian invasion was the fear that Aristides might attach himself to Xerxes and carry with him a considerable party in Athens; and it would therefore be reasonable enough to pass a regulation which would obviate the danger of a banished citizen entering into communication with Persia. As regards Themistocles and Hyperbolus more than one explanation is possible; either the regulation may not have been strictly observed (as would very likely be the case when the danger from Persia was over), or an ostracised person who did not expect to be recalled might prefer to accept *ἀτιμία* and live where he chose. K-W. and H-L. retain *ἐντός*, as also do Kaibel and Kiessling and Poland in their translations. Ferrini, Zuretti, and Reinach accept *ἐκτός*.

XXIII. 3. *πάλιν ἴσχυσεν ἡ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλή*: *cf. Pol.* VIII. (V.) 4, p. 1304ª 20, *ἡ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλὴ εὐδοκιμήσασα ἐν τοῖς Μηδικοῖς ἔδοξε συντονωτέραν ποιῆσαι τὴν πολιτείαν*. In the same sentence the development of the democracy is also attributed to the triumph of the *ναυτικὸς ὄχλος* at Salamis. The two statements are not inconsistent. The first was an immediate result, the second the consequence of a gradual but sure development, which started from the same event.

5. *διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι κ.τ.λ.*: Plutarch tells this story (*Themist.* 10), quoting Aristotle as his authority, though he adds that Cleidemus reported the money in question to have been produced by a device of Themistocles (Rose, *Frag.* 360). Rose also gives (as *Frag.* 361) a quotation from Aelian, who refers to Aristotle for a story about a dog belonging to Xanthippus which swam with the escaping Athenians to Salamis. Plutarch gives the same story, but if the authority is Aristotle it must be in some other of his works, probably one on natural history.

μὲν οὖν ἄλλα πάντα διῴκουν οὐχ ὁμοίως καὶ πρότερον τοῖς νόμοις προσέχοντες, τὴν δὲ τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων αἵρεσιν οὐκ ἐκίνουν, ἀλλ' ἕκτῳ ἔτει μετὰ τὸν Ἐφιάλτου θάνατον ἔγνωσαν καὶ ἐκ ζευγιτῶν προκρίνεσθαι τοὺς κληρωσομένους τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων, καὶ πρῶτος ἦρξεν ἐξ αὐτῶν Μνησιθείδης. οἱ δὲ πρὸ τούτου πάντες ἐξ ἱππέων καὶ πεντακοσιομεδίμνων ἦσαν, οἱ ⟨δὲ⟩ ζευγῖται τὰς ἐγκυκλίους ἦρχον, εἰ μή τι παρεωρᾶτο τῶν ἐν τοῖς νόμοις. ἔτει 3

14. Ferrini, following Wyse, omits *οὐχ*, but the change does not appear to improve the sense. 16. *ἐκίνουν*: MS. *εκεινουν*. *ἀλλ'*: H-L. *ἀλλ' ἢ*, after Blass. 21. *οἱ δὲ ζευγῖται*: MS. om. *δέ*. 22. *τῶν ἐν τοῖς νόμοις*: before these words the MS. originally had the phrase *ὑπὸ τῶν δήμων*, but it has been erased, not accidentally smudged, as H-L. believe; H-L. retain the words, after Paton, who thinks the correction erroneous.

16. *ἕκτῳ ἔτει μετὰ τὸν Ἐφιάλτου θάνατον*: as the final victory of Ephialtes over the Areopagus occurred in 462 B.C. (*cf. supr.*), and the archonship of Mnesitheides falls in 457 B.C., it follows that the murder of Ephialtes must have taken place in the same year as the former event.

17. *καὶ ἐκ ζευγιτῶν*: it is practically certain that originally only the pentacosiomedimni were eligible to the archonship (*cf. supr.*, note on ch. 7, l. 13), but it has generally been supposed, on the authority of Plutarch (*Arist.* 22), that after the Persian wars the archonship was thrown open to all classes without distinction. The more precise statements of Aristotle must overrule the account of Plutarch, and it must be taken for certain that the *ζευγῖται* were not admitted to this office until the date here named, and that the thetes were never legally qualified for it at all, though in practice they were admitted in the time of Aristotle and probably much earlier (*cf.* ch. 7, ll. 34–36). There is no direct evidence to show when the *ἱππεῖς* became eligible, but it may very likely have been at the time indicated by Plutarch, when there also must have been an admission of the lower classes to some of the inferior magistracies, which Plutarch confused with the archonship.

21. *τὰς ἐγκυκλίους*: *i.e.* the inferior magistracies.

22. *εἰ μή τι παρεωρᾶτο*: this seems to mean that although only members of the first two classes were legally eligible to the archonship, yet occasionally persons not so qualified were allowed to slip in; just as in later times persons not possessing even the qualification of a *ζευγίτης* were elected archons by a notorious legal fiction. It is possible that the phrase *ὑπὸ τῶν δήμων*, which has been erased in the

δὲ πέμπτῳ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπὶ Λυσικράτους ἄρχοντος οἱ τριάκοντα δικασταὶ κατέστησαν πάλιν οἱ καλούμενοι
4 κατὰ δήμους· καὶ τρίτῳ μετὰ τοῦτον ἐπὶ Ἀντιδότου διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πολιτῶν, Περικλέους εἰπόντος, ἔγνωσαν μὴ μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως ὃς ἂν μὴ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἀστοῖν ᾖ γεγονώς.

27. Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ δημαγωγεῖν ἐλθόντος

25. μετὰ τοῦτον: so corrected in the MS., as K-W. have pointed out, from μετ αυτον, which H-L. give, after 1st ed. J. E. B. Mayor proposes to add ἔτει after τοῦτον. 28. ᾖ: MS. ην.

MS. after these words, should stand, in which case it indicates that the preliminary selection of candidates for the archonship was held by the demes. *Cf.* note on ch. 22, l. 28.

23. ἐπὶ Λυσικράτους ἄρχοντος: *i.e.* 453 B.C.

οἱ τριάκοντα δικασταί: *cf.* ch. 53, l. 1. These officials were judges of assize for local cases, and were established by Pisistratus (ch. 16, l. 16).

25. ἐπὶ Ἀντιδότου: *i.e.* 451 B.C.

XXVII. 1. **Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ δημαγωγεῖν ἐλθόντος Περικλέους**: it is noticeable that Aristotle does not consider Pericles to have been a leader in the democratic party till about 450 B.C., but he must have been taking a considerable share in politics much earlier. The date of his accusation of Cimon, which Aristotle mentions as his first important public appearance, is not fixed. Plutarch states that Cimon was brought to trial on a charge of bribery after his return from the reduction of Thasos, and that Pericles was the most active of his prosecutors (*Cim.* 14). This would put the date in 463 B.C. (457 B.C. Bauer), which is quite possible. Pericles was then young (νέος ὤν), and it was his first prominent act in public life; and though he no doubt supported Ephialtes and Themistocles in their attack on the Areopagus, he could not be called a leader of his party till several years later. At the same time it must be observed that Aristotle proceeds in the next chapter to say that he established the system of payment for services in the law-courts ἀντιδημαγωγῶν πρὸς τὴν Κίμωνος εὐπορίαν. Cimon died in 449 B.C., so that this important step, which shows Pericles as a leader of the people, must have occurred several years before that date. We know that he was commander of an expedition in the Crissaean Gulf in 454 B.C. (Thuc. I. 111), and it will not be going far wrong to date the ascendancy of Pericles in Athens from a year or two before that date. The murder of Ephialtes and banishment of Themistocles left the way clear for him.

καὶ χρημάτων ἠθροισμένων πολλῶν, συνεβούλευεν
ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῆς ἡγεμονίας καὶ καταβάντας ἐκ
τῶν ἀγρῶν οἰκεῖν ἐν τῷ ἄστει· τροφὴν γὰρ ἔσεσθαι
πᾶσι, τοῖς μὲν στρατευομένοις, τοῖς δὲ φρουροῦσι,
τοῖς δὲ τὰ κοινὰ πράττουσι, εἶθ' οὕτω κατασχήσειν
τὴν ἡγεμονίαν. πεισθέντες δὲ ταῦτα καὶ λαβόντες 2
τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῖς τε συμμάχοις δεσποτικωτέρως
ἐχρῶντο πλὴν Χίων καὶ Λεσβίων καὶ Σαμίων· τού-
τους δὲ φύλακας εἶχον τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἐῶντες τάς τε
πολιτείας παρ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ἄρχειν ὧν ἔτυχον ἄρχοντες.
κατέστησαν δὲ καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς εὐπορίαν τροφῆς, 3
ὥσπερ Ἀριστείδης εἰσηγήσατο. συνέβαινεν γὰρ

XXIV. 2. *ἠθροισμένων πολλῶν*: at first written *πολλῶν ἠθροισμένων*, but a *β* has been written above the former word and an *α* above the latter, to indicate the true order. *ἀθροιζομένων* K-W., which seems an unnecessary departure from the MS. 11. K-W. insert *τάς* before *παρ' αὐτοῖς*, but the MS. reading appears quite possible. After *ἄρχοντες* K-W. add *αὐτοῖς ἐπιτρέποντες καί*, and mark a lacuna, in which they think the cleruchi were mentioned.

XXIV. 2. *συνεβούλευεν κ.τ.λ.*: this counsel to the people to come in from the country, in order to secure the control, first of Athens, and thereby of the allies of Athens, is what one would rather have expected to come from Themistocles. At the same time Aristides is called *προστάτης τοῦ δήμου* just above, and he was never the leader of the aristocratical party. Moreover his conduct in reference to the Confederacy of Delos shows that the imperial idea was strong in him, and, while he would probably not have been a party to any unjust treatment of the allies, he no doubt wished to see Athens in possession of the *ἡγεμονία* of Greece by sea; and Plutarch (*Arist.* 25) quotes Theophrastus as saying that Aristides *ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς πολλὰ πρᾶξαι πρὸς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τῆς πατρίδος ὡς συχνῆς ἀδικίας δεομένης*. The multiplication of paid offices in the state is a first stage in that process of paying the democracy of Athens which was carried to its full extent under Pericles, and which really made the poorer classes in the community, the democracy in the narrower sense of the term, the dominant power in the state.

3. *ἡγεμονίας*: *cf. Pol.* VIII. (V.) 4, p. 1304ª 22, *ὁ ναυτικὸς ὄχλος γενόμενος αἴτιος . . . τῆς ἡγεμονίας διὰ τὴν κατὰ θάλατταν δύναμιν τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἰσχυροτέραν ἐποίησεν.*

ἀπὸ τῶν φόρων καὶ τῶν τελῶν καὶ τῶν συμμάχων πλείους ἢ δισμυρίους ἄνδρας τρέφεσθαι. δικασταὶ μὲν γὰρ ἦ[σα]ν ἑξακισχίλιοι, τοξόται δ' ἑξακόσιοι καὶ χίλιοι, καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἱππεῖς χίλιοι καὶ διακόσιοι, βουλὴ δὲ πεντακόσιοι, καὶ φρουροὶ νεωρίων πεντακόσιοι, καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἐν τῇ πόλει φρουροὶ ν̄, ἀρχαὶ δ' ἔνδημοι μὲν εἰς ἑπτακοσίους ἄνδρας, ὑπερόριοι δ' εἰς ἑπτακοσίους· πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἐπεὶ συνεστήσαντο τὸν πόλεμον ὕστερον ὁπλῖται μὲν δισχίλιοι καὶ πεντακόσιοι, νῆες δὲ φρουρίδες εἴκοσι, ἄλλαι δὲ νῆες αἱ τοὺς φόρους

14. *φόρων*: the first two letters have been blotted in the MS., and are re-written above; H-L. *εἰσφορῶν*. 18. *καί*: K-W. bracket, but K-W². transfer the bracket to *τῇ* in next line. 20. *ἔνδημοι μέν*: in the MS. the word *ἦσαν* follows, but has been cancelled by a row of dots above it. 21. *ἑπτακοσίους*: K-W. consider this an erroneous repetition from the preceding line. 23. *ὁπλῖται*: MS. *οπλειται*.

14. It is not clear how *τῶν συμμάχων* differs from *τῶν φόρων*, as the only way in which the allies gave direct financial assistance to Athens, and so provided support for the Athenian populace, was by the *φόρος*. K-W. suggest that *καὶ τῶν συμμάχων* should be expunged; H-L. read *εἰσφορῶν* for *φόρων*, which is a simpler correction.

15. *πλείους ἢ δισμυρίους*: the numbers given (allowing 4000 men for the twenty guard-ships, at the usual rate of 200 men to each ship) amount in all to 19,750 persons, exclusive of the orphans and other persons mentioned at the end of the list, of whom no estimate is given. Aristotle's statement is therefore fully justified. This list does not, however, apply to the times of Aristides, when, for instance, the dicasts were not paid, but to the result of the policy which Aristides initiated. H-L. consider the whole passage, to the end of the chapter, as spurious.

20. *ἀρχαὶ δ' ἔνδημοι κ.τ.λ.*: it has been generally believed, and is stated by Boeckh, Schömann, and others, that the higher magistrates at Athens were unpaid. But it does not appear that this rests on any definite authority, and two or three passages in this treatise are inconsistent with that view. *Cf.* ch. 62.

21. *ὑπερόριοι*: Prof. Mayor (*Class. Rev.* V. 121) cites Aesch. *in Timarch.* c. 21, § 47, *μηδὲ ἀρχὴν ἀρχέτω μηδεμίαν, μήτε ἔνδημον μήτε ὑπερόριον*.

24. *αἱ τοὺς φόρους ἄγουσαι*: Boeckh (*Staatsh*³. I. 218, II. 345) considers that the subject states brought their tributes to Athens themselves at

ἄγουσαι τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κυάμου δισχιλίους ἄνδρας, ἔτι δὲ πρυτανεῖον καὶ ὀρφανοὶ καὶ δεσμωτῶν φύλακες· ἅπασι γὰρ τούτοις ἀπὸ τῶν κοινῶν ἡ διοίκησις ἦν.

25. Ἡ μὲν οὖν τροφὴ τῷ δήμῳ διὰ τούτων ἐγίγνετο. ἔτη δὲ ἑπτὰ καὶ δέκα μάλιστα μετὰ τὰ Μηδικὰ διέμεινεν ἡ πολιτεία προεστώτων τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν, καίπερ ὑποφερομένη κατὰ μικρόν. αὐξανομένου δὲ τοῦ πλήθους γενόμενος τοῦ δήμου [Col. 11.] προστάτης Ἐφιάλτης ὁ Σοφωνίδου, καὶ δοκῶν

27. διοίκησις: H-L. διασίτησις. XXV. 2. ἐγίγνετο: MS. εγινετο. 6. καί: K-W. and H-L. suspect that this word should be deleted.

the time of the Dionysia in the city, and that the ἀργυρολόγοι were only sent to collect special sums, such as arrears or fines. From this passage of Aristotle it appears that this was not always the case, and that the tribute was collected by certain vessels appointed for the purpose. This statement, however, relates to the arrangements in time of war, when it would clearly not be safe for the allied states to be sending their contributions separately and without protection; and as regards times of peace it is quite likely that Boeckh's view is correct. It appears that the ships charged with the duty in time of war were ten in number (according to the usual estimate of a trireme's crew), two for each of the five tribute-districts of the Athenian empire, and were manned by 2000 persons appointed by lot. The construction of τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κυάμου δισχιλίους ἄνδρας is not clear, but apparently a suitable word must be supplied from ἄγουσαι to govern it, or, as Rutherford suggests, συλλέγουσαι has fallen out before ἄγουσαι. K-W. mark a lacuna between ἄγουσαι and τούς. Blass (followed by Ferrini) substitutes φρουρούς for φόρους, but it does not appear in what the duty of such a squadron consisted. H-L. suggest μισθοφόρους.

26. πρυτανεῖον: this presumably stands for all the persons who for various reasons were maintained at the public expense in the Prytaneum.

XXV. 2. ἔτη δὲ ἑπτὰ καὶ δέκα μάλιστα μετὰ τὰ Μηδικά: this presumably covers the whole period up to the archonship of Conon, mentioned just below, which belongs to the year 462 B.C. In that case Aristotle reckons the end of the Persian war as 478 B.C., the date of the Confederacy of Delos.

6. Σοφωνίδου: the second letter appears to have been written first as ω, but is corrected to ο, which form is confirmed by Aelian (*Var. Hist.* II. 43, III. 17, XI. 9). With this word the tenth column of the MS. breaks off, the rest of the column and the whole of another

ἀδωροδόκητος εἶναι καὶ δίκαιος πρὸς τὴν πολιτείαν,
2 ἐπέθετο τῇ βουλῇ. καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ἀνεῖλεν πολλοὺς τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν, ἀγῶνας ἐπι[φ]έρων περὶ τῶν διῳκημένων· ἔπειτα τῆς βουλῆς ἐπὶ Κόνωνος ἄρχοντος ἅπαντα περιείλετο τὰ ἐπίθετα δι' ὧν ἦν ἡ τῆς πολιτείας φυλακή, καὶ τὰ μ[ὲν τ]οῖς πεντακοσίοις, τὰ δὲ τῷ δήμῳ καὶ τοῖς δικαστηρίοις
3 ἀπέδωκεν. ἔπραττε δὲ ταῦτα συναιτίου γενομένου

11. *περιείλετο*: so K-W., Richards; MS. *περιειλε*, H-L. *παρείλετο*. 14. *γενομένου*: H-L. *γιγνομένου*.

column being occupied by writing of a different description, after which the text of the Aristotle is resumed. A description and text of the alien matter is given in Appendix II.

9. *ἀγῶνας ἐπιφέρων*: so Plutarch speaks of Ephialtes (*Pericles* 10), *φοβερὸν ὄντα τοῖς ὀλιγαρχικοῖς, καὶ περὶ τὰς εὐθύνας καὶ διώξεις τῶν τὸν δῆμον ἀδικούντων ἀπαραίτητον*. *Cf.* Ael. *Var. Hist.* XI. 9.

10. *ἐπὶ Κόνωνος ἄρχοντος*: this fixes for the first time a doubtful date in Athenian history, though it has been known that the overthrow of the Areopagus must have occurred about 460 B.C. From the whole of the present passage it is clear that Pericles had nothing to do, as a leader at any rate, with the attack on the Areopagus. Aristotle mentions him below (ch. 27) as taking away some of the privileges of the Areopagus, but this was apparently at a later time and a much less important affair, though it may justify the retention of his name in the *Politics* (II. 12), where it has been suspected of being a corrupt insertion in the text. This part of Aristotle's treatise does much to clear up an obscure period in the history of Athens, and to assign events to precise dates and authors where before we only knew of their bare occurrence. Among other things it is clear that the preeminence of Pericles dates from a later time than has generally been assumed.

14. *συναιτίου γενομένου Θεμιστοκλέους*: the mention of Themistocles in this connection revolutionises the history of the later part of his career, and raises several chronological difficulties. We know from Thucydides (I. 135–138) that he was eventually ostracised, and that while living in banishment he was charged with Medism on certain evidence which was found at Sparta in connection with the condemnation and death of Pausanias; on which occurred his flight to Persia, where he arrived in the reign of Artaxerxes and died some time afterwards. No dates or precise indications of time are given by Thucydides or any other early authority, but it has been usual to place the ostracism in 471 B.C., in accordance with Diodorus, and the flight to

Θεμιστοκλέους, ὃς ἦν μὲν τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν, ἔμελλε

Persia about 466 B.C.; the latter date being fixed by the statement of Thucydides that Themistocles, during his flight, narrowly escaped capture by the Athenian fleet besieging Naxos. The siege of Naxos preceded the battle of the Eurymedon, which is fixed with practical certainty for 466 B.C. Xerxes died in 465 B.C., and Thucydides states that Themistocles on his arrival in Persia found Artaxerxes νεωστὶ βασιλεύοντα. The present passage, on the other hand, states that he was still in Athens in 462 B.C. He was then expecting a trial on the charge of Medism. This cannot be the charge which was made after the discovery of his complicity with Pausanias, since that took place while he was living in banishment; but if the trial ever took place at all, and was not altogether averted by his proceedings against the Areopagus, it must be the earlier one, in which he secured an acquittal (Diod. XI. 54, *cf.* Grote, ed. 1870, vol. V. p. 136). His ostracism cannot then well have occurred before 461 B.C., and his flight to Persia may be placed approximately in 460 B.C. Artaxerxes would then have been on the throne about five years, which is not inconsistent with Thucydides' phrase νεωστὶ βασιλεύοντα. The fifth year of a king who ruled for forty might well be spoken of as in the beginning of the reign. But the difficulty raised by Thucydides' reference to the siege of Naxos is not so easy to explain, and we are practically reduced to two alternatives. Either the story of Themistocles' having been nearly carried into the middle of the Athenians is wrongly attached to the siege of Naxos, and should be connected instead with some other operations about 460 B.C.; or two inconsistent accounts of the later years of Themistocles were current, of which one was adopted by Thucydides, the other by Aristotle, a hundred years later. In favour of the date of Thucydides is the fact that he was writing so much nearer to the events recorded, and that it appears to harmonise better with the chronology of the later historians and chronologists. On the other hand, Aristotle's story is detailed and characteristic, and it is at least as difficult to understand how it became current if it is false, as to explain how it was omitted by other authorities if it is true. Bauer, who makes the statement of Aristotle as to Themistocles' presence in Athens in 462 B.C. the cornerstone for the chronology of the period, also accepts Thucydides' reference to the siege of Naxos. The result is a general lowering of the accepted dates, placing the siege of Naxos and battle of Eurymedon in 460 B.C., the beginning of the Messenian revolt and the defeat of the Athenians at Drabescus in 459 B.C., the Athenian expedition to Egypt in 456 B.C., its failure and the end of the Messenian revolt in 450 B.C., Cimon's expedition to Cyprus and the death of Themistocles in 448 B.C. The contrary indications in Diodorus, Eusebius, &c., are rejected as due to a single false authority, probably Ephorus. There is not space to

δὲ κρίνεσθαι Μηδισμοῦ. βουλόμενος δὲ καταλυθῆναι τὴν βουλὴν ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς πρὸς μὲν τὸν Ἐφιάλτην ἔλεγεν ὅτι συναρπάζειν αὐτὸν ἡ βουλὴ μέλλει, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς Ἀρεοπαγίτας ὅτι δείξει τινὰς συνιστα-

examine Bauer's ingenious theory here, but it may be observed that it involves altering the text of Thucydides in IV. 102, 3 (22nd year for 29th). As to the date of the death of Themistocles, it is not very material and cannot be exactly determined. Plutarch, however, tells us that he was sixty-five when he died and that he was a young man (*νέος ὢν ἔτι, c.* 3) at the time of Marathon. If then his birth be placed in 515 B.C. (and 520 B.C. would be the earliest date of which Plutarch's phrase could reasonably admit), his death would fall about 450 B.C. The narratives of Thucydides and Plutarch imply that he lived for some years in Persia, but this would allow a sufficient margin for any purpose; and Plutarch's account of his death is too apocryphal for us to attach much weight to the connection in time which he indicates between it and the Athenian expedition under Cimon at the time of the second Egyptian revolt.

It is strange that Plutarch, who was certainly acquainted with the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, should not have mentioned the part taken by Themistocles in the overthrow of the Areopagus; and his total omission to refer to the story, whether he believed it to be true or false, can hardly be explained except on the theory that in actually writing his Lives he used the notes and extracts he had previously made, without having the complete work before him. This would also explain the difficulties raised by his account of Draco and Solon. The behaviour of Themistocles, as indicated by Aristotle, with his ingenious intrigue whereby he continued to be able to represent himself as serving either side until the last moment, is entirely in accordance with his character as we know it from the rest of his life, and the story has all the appearance of truth. Though Plutarch does not mention it, there is, however, one extant reference to the story, in the argument to the Areopagitica of Isocrates (contained in Dindorf's ed. of the Scholia to Aeschines and Isocrates, p. 111), which explains the original loss of power by the Areopagus thus, *Ἐφιάλτης τις καὶ Θεμιστοκλῆς χρεωστοῦντες τῇ πόλει χρήματα καὶ εἰδότες ὅτι ἐὰν δικασθῶσιν* [qu. *δικάσωσιν*?] *οἱ Ἀρεοπαγῖται, πάντως ἀποδώσουσι, καταλῦσαι αὐτοὺς ἔπεισαν τὴν πόλιν, οὔπως τινὸς μελλοντος κριθῆναι. ὁ γὰρ Ἀριστοτέλης λέγει ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ὅτι καὶ ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς αἴτιος ἦν μὴ πάντα δικάζειν τοὺς Ἀρεοπαγίτας· δῆθεν μὲν ὡς δι' αὐτοὺς τοῦτο ποιοῦντες, τὸ δ' ἀληθὲς διὰ τοῦτο πάντα κατασκευάζοντες. εἶτα οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἀσμένως ἀκούσαντες τῆς τοιαύτης συμβουλῆς κατέλυσαν αὐτούς.* (Part of this quotation is given by Rose as *Frag.* 366.) This passage has, however, been ignored by the historians.

μένους ἐπὶ καταλύσει τῆς πολιτείας. ἀγαγὼν δὲ τοὺς ἀφαιρεθέντας τῆς βουλῆς οὗ διέτριβεν ὁ Ἐφιάλτης, ἵνα δείξῃ τ[οὺ]ς ἀθροιζομένους, διελέγετο μετὰ σπουδῆς αὐτοῖς. ὁ δ' Ἐφιάλτης ὡς 4
εἶδεν καταπλαγεὶς καθίζει μονοχίτων ἐπὶ τὸν βωμόν. θαυμασάντων δὲ πάντων τὸ γεγον[ὸς] καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα συναθροισθείσης τῆς βουλῆς τῶν πεντακοσίων κατηγόρουν τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν ὅ τ' Ἐφιάλτης καὶ ⟨ὁ⟩ Θεμιστοκλῆς, καὶ πάλιν ἐν τῷ δήμῳ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, ἕως περιείλοντο αὐτῶν τὴν δύναμιν. καὶ ἀνῃρέθη δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἐφιάλτης δολοφονηθεὶς μετ' οὐ πολὺν χρόνον δι' Ἀριστοδίκου [τ]οῦ Ταναγραίου. ἡ μὲν οὖν τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν βουλὴ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ἀπεστερήθη τῆς ἐπιμελείας.

26. Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα συνέβαινεν ἀνίεσθαι μᾶλλον τὴν πολιτείαν διὰ τοὺς προθύμως δημαγωγοῦντας. κατὰ γὰρ τοὺς καιροὺς τούτους συνέπεσε μηδ'

21. *ἀφαιρεθέντας*: H-L. *ἐφαιρεθέντας*, K-W. *αἱρεθέντας* (suggested in 1st ed.), Poland *ἐξαιρεθέντας*, Richards *αἱρεθέντας ὑπό*. *οὗ*: H-L. *οἷ*. 28. *ὁ*: added by K-W., Kontos, H-L. 29. *περιείλοντο*: MS. *περειλοντο*, H-L. *παρείλοντο*. 30. K-W. suppose a hiatus after the first *καί*, *καὶ ⟨ὁ μὲν Θεμιστοκλῆς . . . .⟩*. H-L. omit it, after J. B. Mayor and Blass. XXVI. 1. *ἀνίεσθαι*: MS. *ανειεσθαι*.

21. *τοὺς ἀφαιρεθέντας τῆς βουλῆς*: this must be taken in the unusual sense of 'the persons selected for the purpose by the Areopagus.' Mr. W. L. Newman (*Classical Review*, V. 164) quotes in illustration Arist. *H. A.* VI. 22, 576^{b} 23, *ὥρα δ' οὐκ ἀφαιρεῖται οὐδεμία τεταγμένη τοῦ ὀχεύεσθαι καὶ ὀχεύειν*. Themistocles undertook to lead a deputation from the Areopagus to the house of Ephialtes, in order to show them the conspirators assembled there; but on arriving near the place he let himself be seen talking ostentatiously with them, and Ephialtes, who had been previously warned, made his escape to sanctuary. It is possible we should read *αἱρεθέντας*, and this is adopted by K-W.

31. *δι' Ἀριστοδίκου τοῦ Ταναγραίου*: this statement is quoted by Plutarch (*Pericl.* 10) as from Aristotle, *Ἐφιάλτην μὲν οὖν . . . ἐπιβουλεύσαντες οἱ ἐχθροὶ δι' Ἀριστοδίκου τοῦ Ταναγραίου κρυφαίως ἀνεῖλον, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης εἴρηκεν* (Rose, *Frag.* 367).

ἡγεμόνα ἔχειν τοὺς ἐπιεικεστέρους, ἀλλ' αὐτῶν προεστάναι Κίμωνα τὸν Μιλτιάδου, νεώτερον ὄντα καὶ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ὀψὲ προσελθόντα, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἐφθάρθαι τοὺς πολλοὺς κατὰ πόλεμον· τῆς γὰρ στρατείας γιγνομένης ἐν τοῖς τότε χρόνοις ἐκ καταλόγου, καὶ στρατηγῶν ἐφισ[τ]αμένων ἀπείρων μὲν τοῦ πολεμεῖν τιμωμένων δὲ διὰ τὰς πατρικὰς δόξας, αἰεὶ συνέβαινεν τῶν ἐξιόντων ἀνὰ δισχιλίους ἢ τρισχιλίους ἀπόλλυσθαι, [ὥ]στε ἀναλίσκεσθαι

2 τοὺς ἐπιεικεῖς καὶ τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῶν εὐπόρων. τὰ

4. ἡγεμόνα: there has been some blunder in writing this word in the MS., and the first three letters are very doubtful. 5. νεώτερον: K-W. suggest νωθρότερον doubtfully, and so Kontos, approved by van Herwerden; Weil ἐνεώτερον. 8. γιγνομένης: MS. γινομενης. 11. δισχιλίους: MS. δισχειλιους.

XXVI. 5. *νεώτερον ὄντα*: if Cimon took part in the battle of Salamis and accompanied Aristides on the naval expedition which resulted in the establishment of the Confederacy of Delos, as Plutarch tells us (*Cim.* 5, 6), he cannot have been less than about thirty-five at the time of the overthrow of the Areopagus by Ephialtes. At the same time we know that he took no part in politics in early life, and though his great victory at the Eurymedon was won in 466 B.C., it is quite intelligible that he was not of much weight as a political leader in the controversies of this time, and that the aristocratical party was therefore practically without a head. Moreover Plutarch's authority is not above suspicion in his narratives of the early performances of his heroes, as has been seen in the case of Pisistratus. It hardly seems reasonable, howeyer, to speak of the victor of the Eurymedon as *νεώτερος*, however inexperienced he might be in politics, and it is possible that the text is corrupt.

11. *ἀνὰ δισχιλίους ἢ τρισχιλίους*: *cf. Pol.* VIII. (V.) 3, p. 1303ª 8, *καὶ ἐν Ἀθήναις ἀτυχούντων πεζῇ οἱ γνώριμοι ἐλάττους ἐγένοντο διὰ τὸ ἐκ καταλόγου στρατεύεσθαι ὑπὸ τὸν Λακωνικὸν πόλεμον*, and Isocr. *De Pace*, § 87, p. 176, where, after enumerating the great disasters which had from time to time befallen Athens in connection with her maritime aspirations, he proceeds *τὰς δὲ κατὰ δέκα καὶ πέντε καὶ πλείους τούτων ἀπολλυμένας (τριήρεις) καὶ τοὺς κατὰ χιλίους καὶ δισχιλίους ἀποθνῄσκοντας τίς ἂν ἐξαριθμήσειεν; πλὴν ἓν ἦν τοῦτο τῶν ἐγκυκλίων, ταφὰς ποιεῖν καθ' ἕκαστον τὸν ἐνιαυτόν, κ.τ.λ.*

μὲν οὖν ἄλλα πάντα διῴκουν οὐχ ὁμοίως καὶ πρότερον τοῖς νόμοις προσέχοντες, τὴν δὲ τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων αἵρεσιν οὐκ ἐκίνουν, ἀλλ' ἕκτῳ ἔτει μετὰ τὸν Ἐφιάλτου θάνατον ἔγνωσαν καὶ ἐκ ζευγιτῶν προκρίνεσθαι τοὺς κληρωσομένους τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων, καὶ πρῶτος ἦρξεν ἐξ αὐτῶν Μνησιθείδης. οἱ δὲ πρὸ τούτου πάντες ἐξ ἱππέων καὶ πεντακοσιομεδίμνων ἦσαν, οἱ ⟨δὲ⟩ ζευγῖται τὰς ἐγκυκλίους ἦρχον, εἰ μή τι παρεωρᾶτο τῶν ἐν τοῖς νόμοις. ἔτει 3

14. Ferrini, following Wyse, omits *οὐχ*, but the change does not appear to improve the sense. 16. *ἐκίνουν*: MS. *εκεινουν*. *ἀλλ'*: H-L. *ἀλλ' ἤ*, after Blass. 21. *οἱ δὲ ζευγῖται*: MS. om. *δέ*. 22. *τῶν ἐν τοῖς νόμοις*: before these words the MS. originally had the phrase *ὑπὸ τῶν δήμων*, but it has been erased, not accidentally smudged, as H-L. believe; H-L. retain the words, after Paton, who thinks the correction erroneous.

16. *ἕκτῳ ἔτει μετὰ τὸν Ἐφιάλτου θάνατον*: as the final victory of Ephialtes over the Areopagus occurred in 462 B.C. (*cf. supr.*), and the archonship of Mnesitheides falls in 457 B.C., it follows that the murder of Ephialtes must have taken place in the same year as the former event.

17. *καὶ ἐκ ζευγιτῶν*: it is practically certain that originally only the pentacosiomedimni were eligible to the archonship (*cf. supr.*, note on ch. 7, l. 13), but it has generally been supposed, on the authority of Plutarch (*Arist.* 22), that after the Persian wars the archonship was thrown open to all classes without distinction. The more precise statements of Aristotle must overrule the account of Plutarch, and it must be taken for certain that the *ζευγῖται* were not admitted to this office until the date here named, and that the thetes were never legally qualified for it at all, though in practice they were admitted in the time of Aristotle and probably much earlier (*cf.* ch. 7, ll. 34–36). There is no direct evidence to show when the *ἱππεῖς* became eligible, but it may very likely have been at the time indicated by Plutarch, when there also must have been an admission of the lower classes to some of the inferior magistracies, which Plutarch confused with the archonship.

21. *τὰς ἐγκυκλίους*: *i.e.* the inferior magistracies.

22. *εἰ μή τι παρεωρᾶτο*: this seems to mean that although only members of the first two classes were legally eligible to the archonship, yet occasionally persons not so qualified were allowed to slip in; just as in later times persons not possessing even the qualification of a *ζευγίτης* were elected archons by a notorious legal fiction. It is possible that the phrase *ὑπὸ τῶν δήμων*, which has been erased in the

δὲ πέμπτῳ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπὶ Λυσικράτους ἄρχοντος οἱ τριάκοντα δικασταὶ κατέστησαν πάλιν οἱ καλούμενοι κατὰ δήμους·
4 καὶ τρίτῳ μετὰ τοῦτον ἐπὶ Ἀντιδότου διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πολιτῶν, Περικλέους εἰπόντος, ἔγνωσαν μὴ μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως ὃς ἂν μὴ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἀστοῖν ᾖ γεγονώς.

27. Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ δημαγωγεῖν ἐλθόντος

25. *μετὰ τοῦτον*: so corrected in the MS., as K-W. have pointed out, from *μετ αυτον*, which H-L. give, after 1st ed. J. E. B. Mayor proposes to add *ἔτει* after *τοῦτον*. 28. *ᾖ*: MS. *ην*.

MS. after these words, should stand, in which case it indicates that the preliminary selection of candidates for the archonship was held by the demes. *Cf.* note on ch. 22, l. 28.

23. *ἐπὶ Λυσικράτους ἄρχοντος*: *i.e.* 453 B.C.

οἱ τριάκοντα δικασταί: *cf.* ch. 53, l. 1. These officials were judges of assize for local cases, and were established by Pisistratus (ch. 16, l. 16).

25. *ἐπὶ Ἀντιδότου*: *i.e.* 451 B.C.

XXVII. 1. *Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ δημαγωγεῖν ἐλθόντος Περικλέους*: it is noticeable that Aristotle does not consider Pericles to have been a leader in the democratic party till about 450 B.C., but he must have been taking a considerable share in politics much earlier. The date of his accusation of Cimon, which Aristotle mentions as his first important public appearance, is not fixed. Plutarch states that Cimon was brought to trial on a charge of bribery after his return from the reduction of Thasos, and that Pericles was the most active of his prosecutors (*Cim.* 14). This would put the date in 463 B.C. (457 B.C. Bauer), which is quite possible. Pericles was then young (*νέος ὤν*), and it was his first prominent act in public life; and though he no doubt supported Ephialtes and Themistocles in their attack on the Areopagus, he could not be called a leader of his party till several years later. At the same time it must be observed that Aristotle proceeds in the next chapter to say that he established the system of payment for services in the law-courts *ἀντιδημαγωγῶν πρὸς τὴν Κίμωνος εὐπορίαν*. Cimon died in 449 B.C., so that this important step, which shows Pericles as a leader of the people, must have occurred several years before that date. We know that he was commander of an expedition in the Crissaean Gulf in 454 B.C. (Thuc. I. 111), and it will not be going far wrong to date the ascendancy of Pericles in Athens from a year or two before that date. The murder of Ephialtes and banishment of Themistocles left the way clear for him.

Περικλέους, καὶ πρῶτον εὐδοκιμήσαντος ὅτε κατη-
γόρησε τὰς εὐθύνας Κίμωνος *στρατηγοῦντος νέος*
ὤν, δημοτικωτέραν ἔτι συνέβη γενέσθαι τὴν πολι-
τείαν· καὶ γὰρ τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν *ἔνια παρείλετο,*
καὶ μάλιστα προὔτρεψεν τὴν πόλιν ἐπὶ τὴν ναυτικὴν
δύναμιν, ἐξ ἧς συνέβη θαρρήσαντας τοὺς πολλοὺς
ἅπασαν τὴν πολιτείαν μᾶλλον ἄγειν εἰς αὑτούς.
μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι *ναυμαχίαν ἑνὸς δεῖν πεντη-* 2
κοστῷ ἔτει ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρ[ου] *ἄρχοντος ὁ πρὸς* Πελο-
ποννησίους ἐνέστη πόλεμος, ἐν ᾧ κατακλεισθεὶς ὁ
δῆμος ἐν τῷ ἄστει καὶ συνεθισθεὶς ἐν ταῖς στρατείαις
μισθοφορεῖν, τὰ μὲν ἑκὼν τὰ δὲ ἄκων προῃρεῖτο
τὴν πολιτείαν διοικεῖν αὐτός. ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ μισθο- 3
φόρα τὰ δικαστήρια Περικλῆς *πρῶτος, ἀντιδημαγω-*
γῶν πρὸς τὴν Κίμωνος *εὐπορίαν. ὁ γὰρ* Κίμων, *ἅτε*

XXVII. 2. πρῶτον: MS. πρωτου. 4. ἔτι: wrongly altered to επι in MS. 5. παρείλετο: K-W. περιείλετο; *cf.* 25, ll. 11, 29. 9. δεῖν: MS. δει, which H-L. retain; *cf.* 19, l. 49. 11. ἐνέστη: H-L. συνέστη, but *cf.* 5, ll. 12, 25; 17, l. 19; 41, l. 3, in all of which places H-L. substitute or suggest συν. κατακλεισθείς: MS. κατακλισθεις. 12. στρατείαις: MS. στρατιαις.

5. τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν ἔνια παρείλετο: this may mean either that Pericles assisted to some extent in Ephialtes' proceedings for stripping the Areopagus of its power, or that he carried the same movement further after the death of Ephialtes. In either case it is consistent with his not having taken a leading part in the great struggle.

9. ἑνὸς δεῖν πεντηκοστῷ ἔτει: the date of the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war is of course as well fixed as any date in Greek history. Pythodorus was archon in 432 B.C., which is the 49th year after Salamis, and Thucydides (II. 2) tells us that he had only four months of his archonship still to run at the time of the Theban attack on Plataea, which fixes the date in the spring of 431 B.C.

14. ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ μισθοφόρα τὰ δικαστήρια Περικλῆς πρῶτος: this confirms the passage in the *Politics* (II. 12), τὰ δὲ δικαστήρια μισθοφόρα κατέστησε Περικλῆς. *Cf.* Plat. *Gorg.* 515 E (cited by Prof. Mayor, *Class. Rev.* V. 121), ταυτὶ γὰρ ἔγωγε ἀκούω, Περικλέα πεποιηκέναι Ἀθηναίους ἀργοὺς καὶ δειλοὺς καὶ λάλους καὶ φιλαργύρους, εἰς μισθοφορίαν πρῶτον καταστήσαντα.

τυραννικὴν ἔχων οὐσίαν, πρῶτον μὲν τὰς κοινὰς λῃτουργίας ἐλῃτούργει λαμπρῶς, ἔπειτα τῶν δημοτῶν ἔτρεφε πολλούς· ἐξῆν γὰρ τῷ βουλομένῳ Λακιαδῶν καθ' ἑκάστην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐλθόντι παρ' αὐτὸν ἔχειν τὰ μέτρια, ἔτι δὲ τὰ χωρία πάντα ἄφρακτα ἦν, ὅπως ἐξῇ τῷ βουλομένῳ τῆς ὀπώρας

4 ἀπολαύειν. πρὸς δὴ ταύτην τὴν χορηγίαν ἐπιλειπόμενος ὁ Περικλῆς τῇ οὐσίᾳ, συμβουλεύσαντος αὐτῷ Δαμωνίδου τοῦ Οἰῆθεν (ὃς ἐδόκει τῶν πολλῶν

19. πολλούς: the MS. originally had τούς before this, but the article is erased. Paton would restore it. 22. ἐξῇ: MS. εξην. *Cf.* ην for ηι. 26, l. 28. 23. ἐπιλειπόμενος: H-L. ἀπολειπόμενος, after Richards and Kontos; *cf.* 20, l. 6. 25. ὅς: MS. ους. πολλῶν: H-L., Wyse, Gennadios, Poland πολιτικῶν, reading MS. as πολέμων (as 1st ed.).

18. λῃτουργίας ἐλῃτούργει: this spelling is supported by inscriptions of the fourth century (C. I. A. II. add. 554, b, 14; 557, 5, 6; 172, 4). On the other hand κατακλεισθείς above (l. 11) is rightly spelt with ει, since with κλῃς and its compounds the later spelling is established by about 380 B.C. *Cf.* Meisterhans, pp. 28–30.

20. Λακιαδῶν: Plutarch (*Cim.* 10) quotes Aristotle (though without specifying the precise work) as authority for this fact, in opposition to the story that Cimon kept open house for the whole of the poorer population of Athens (Rose, *Frag.* 363). *Cf.* also *Per.* 9, which reproduces the substance of the present passage.

24. συμβουλεύσαντος κ.τ.λ.: quoted by Plutarch (*Per.* 9), τρέπεται πρὸς τὴν τῶν δημοσίων διανομήν, συμβουλεύσαντος αὐτῷ Δαμωνίδου τοῦ Οἰῆθεν, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης ἱστόρηκεν (Rose, *Frag.* 365).

25. Δαμωνίδου τοῦ Οἰῆθεν: it has been proposed by Mr. Wyse (following Oncken on Plut. *Per.* 9) to prefix Δάμωνος, on the strength of Plut. *Per.* 4, *Nic.* 6, *Arist.* 1, where Damon the musician is spoken of as Pericles' adviser; but it would be flying in the face of all rational criticism to alter the text, when not only is the article after Δαμωνίδου irregular if Δάμωνος precedes (as Mr. Wyse himself admits), but also Plutarch himself, though elsewhere speaking of Δάμων, here, in avowedly quoting Aristotle, has Δαμωνίδης. This is clear evidence that Aristotle spoke of Damonides and not of Damon, and the only question is what bearing this has on the passages in Plutarch where Damon is mentioned. Plutarch (*Per.* 4) says that Damon's music was a mere blind, and that he was a cunning sophist who associated with Pericles καθάπερ ἀθλητῇ τῶν πολιτικῶν ἀλείπτης καὶ διδάσκαλος; in spite of which he was found out and ostracised ὡς μεγαλοπράγμων καὶ φιλο-

εἰσηγητὴς εἶναι τῷ Περικλεῖ, διὸ καὶ ὠστράκισαν
αὐτὸν ὕστερον), ἐπεὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις ἡττᾶτο, διδόναι τοῖς
πολλοῖς τὰ αὑτῶν, κατεσκεύασε μισθοφορὰν τοῖς
δικασταῖς· ἀφ' ὧν αἰτιῶνταί τινες χείρω γενέσθαι,
κληρουμένων ἐπιμελῶς ἀεὶ μᾶλλον τῶν τυχόντων
ἢ τῶν ἐπιεικῶν ἀνθρώπων. ἤρξατο δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα 5
καὶ τὸ δεκάζειν, πρώτου καταδείξαντος Ἀνύτου μετὰ
τὴν ἐν Πύλῳ στρατηγίαν. κρινόμενος γὰρ ὑπό
τινων διὰ τὸ ἀποβαλεῖν Πύλον, δεκάσας τὸ δικαστή-
ριον ἀπέφυγεν.

28. Ἕως μὲν οὖν Περικλῆς προειστήκει τοῦ
δήμου βελτίω τὰ κατὰ τὴν πολιτείαν ἦν, τελευτή-
σαντος δὲ Περικλέους πολὺ χείρω. πρῶτον γὰρ 2
τότε προστάτην ἔλαβεν ὁ δῆμος οὐκ εὐδοκιμοῦντα
παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιεικέσιν· ἐν δὲ τοῖς πρότερον χρόνοις
ἀεὶ διετέλουν οἱ ἐπιεικεῖς δημαγωγοῦντες. ἐξ ἀρχῆς
μὲν γὰρ καὶ πρῶτος ἐγένετο προστάτης τοῦ δήμου

29. δικασταῖς: H-L. δικαστηρίοις, after Blass and Richards, to justify χείρω which follows. ὧν: H-L. οὗ, after Richards. χείρω: K-W. χείρους. Rutherford, J. B. Mayor, Ferrini and Bury insert τὰ κατὰ τὴν πολιτείαν or equivalent phrases, but it is not easy to explain such an omission, and the sense of the passage is clear as it stands. 32. Ἀνύτου: MS. αυτου. XXVIII. 2. βελτίω: MS. βελτειω. 4. εὐδοκιμοῦντα: MS. ευδοκιμουμενοντα, with -ντα written above as a correction; the letters -μενοντα, which should have been struck out, remain uncancelled.

τύραννος, or (*Arist.* 1) ὅτι τὸ φρονεῖν ἐδόκει τις εἶναι περιττός. This does not sound very probable as history, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that Plutarch confused two persons, Damon the son of Damonides, apparently of the deme Ὄα (so Wyse, quoting Steph. Byz. *s. v.* Ὄα, Δάμων Δαμωνίδου Ὄαθεν), and Damonides of the deme Οἴη. The former was a musician, the latter a politician, and Plutarch has transferred to the former a portion of the attributes of the latter. *Cf.* also Gomperz, *Deutsche Rundschau*, May 1891, p. 232.

32. καταδείξαντος Ἀνύτου κ.τ.λ.: this passage is referred to by Harpocration (*s. v.* δεκάζων), Ἀριστοτέλης δ' ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ Ἄνυτόν φησι καταδεῖξαι τὸ δεκάζειν τὰ δικαστήρια (Rose, *Frag.* 371).

XXVIII. 7. προστάτης τοῦ δήμου: the way in which Aristotle uses this

Σόλων, δεύτερος δὲ Πεισίστρατος, τῶν εὐγενῶν καὶ γνωρίμων· καταλυθείσης δὲ τῆς τυραννίδος Κλεισθένης, τοῦ γένους ὢν τῶν Ἀλκμεωνιδῶν, καὶ τούτῳ μὲν οὐδεὶς ἦν ἀντιστασιώτης ὡς ἐξέπεσον οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἰσαγόραν. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τοῦ μὲν δήμου προειστήκει Ξάνθιππος, τῶν δὲ γνωρίμων Μιλτιάδης· ἔπειτα Θεμιστοκλῆς καὶ Ἀριστείδης· μετὰ δὲ τούτους Ἐφιάλτης μὲν τοῦ δήμου, Κίμων δ' ὁ Μιλτιάδου τῶν εὐπόρων· εἶτα Περικλῆς μὲν τοῦ δήμου, Θουκυδίδης δὲ τῶν ἑτέρων, κηδεστὴς ὢν
3 *Κίμωνος. Περικλέους δὲ τελευτήσαντος τῶν μὲν ἐπιφανῶν προειστήκει Νικίας, ὁ ἐν Σικελίᾳ τελευτήσας, τοῦ δὲ δήμου Κλέων ὁ Κλεαινέτου, ὃς δοκεῖ μάλιστα διαφθεῖραι τὸν δῆμον ταῖς ὁρμαῖς, καὶ πρῶτος ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἀνέκραγε καὶ ἐλοιδορήσατο*

8. *τῶν εὐγενῶν καὶ γνωρίμων*: bracketed by K-W.; H-L. (after Richards) insert *ὢν* after *εὐγενῶν*. 10. *Ἀλκμεωνιδῶν*: MS. *αλκμεονιδων*. 20. *Κλεαινέτου*: MS. *κλαιενετου*.

title shows that it had become a technical phrase indicating a definite position, but it does not support the view of those who hold it to have been an office to which there was a regular appointment. The most that it proves is that the popular party in the assembly recognised one individual as its especial leader at any given time, and that he was accepted by the world at large as the representative of that party for the time being. The fact that Solon and Pisistratus and Cleisthenes are spoken of in precisely the same way as Cleon and Cleophon is enough to prove this; and it may further be noticed that Miltiades, Cimon, and Thucydides are represented as holding exactly the same position in reference to the *εὔποροι* or *γνώριμοι* as their rivals have in reference to the *δῆμος*.

8. *τῶν εὐγενῶν καὶ γνωρίμων*: these words are bracketed by K-W., presumably as having been added by some one who thought Pisistratus was represented as the head of the opposite party to Solon. If they are genuine they emphasise the fact stated in the preceding sentence, by pointing out that both Solon and Pisistratus, though *προστάται τοῦ δήμου*, belonged to the upper classes.

καὶ περιζωσάμενος ἐδημηγόρησε, τῶν ἄλλων ἐν κόσμῳ λεγόντων. εἶτα μετὰ τούτους τῶν μὲν ἑτέρων Θηραμένης ὁ Ἅγνωνος, τοῦ δὲ δήμου Κλεοφῶν ὁ λυροποιός, ὃς καὶ τὴν διωβελίαν ἐπόρισε

26. διωβελίαν: MS. διωβολιαν.

23. περιζωσάμενος: the scholiast to Lucian (*Tim.* 30) refers to Aristotle for this fact, Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ καὶ περιζωσάμενον αὐτὸν λέγει δημηγορῆσαι, εἰς τὴν θρασύτητα αὐτοῦ ἀποσκώπτων. This is given by Neumann in his edition of the fragments (*Frag.* 33), but Rose adopts another reading of the passage, which assigns Aristotle's authority instead to a statement that Cleon obstructed the making of peace with Sparta (*Frag.* 368). The scholiast to Aeschines (Dindorf, p. 14) uses nearly the same words, λέγεται δὲ Κλέων ὁ δημαγωγὸς παραβὰς τὸ ἐξ ἔθους σχῆμα περιζωσάμενος δημηγορῆσαι.

26. τὴν διωβελίαν: this cannot refer either to the payment for attendance at the ecclesia, which we know from ch. 41 to have been instituted by Agyrrhius and Heracleides, nor to that for service in the courts, which it is certain from Aristophanes had been raised to three obols long before the time of Cleophon (*Knights*, 51, 255; *Wasps*, 609, 684, 690). The διωβελία *par excellence* was the same as the theoricon, the payment to the populace of the price of admission to the theatre. This, however, is generally assigned to Pericles, on the authority of Plutarch (*Pericl.* 9) and Ulpian (on Demosthenes' *Olynth.* I). The authority nevertheless is not convincing. Plutarch speaks somewhat generally (θεωρικοῖς καὶ δικαστικοῖς λήμμασιν ἄλλαις τε μισθοφοραῖς καὶ χορηγίαις συνδεκάσας τὸ πλῆθος), and his accuracy is not to be trusted in such details; in fact, in the same chapter he speaks of Pericles as the chief agent in the overthrow of the Areopagus. It therefore seems best to take the word here in its natural sense, and to suppose that the diobelia was first established by Cleophon and augmented by Callicrates to three obols. There are, however, still some difficulties to be explained. It is evident from Demosthenes that the price of seats at the theatre continued to be two obols (*de Cor.* p. 234, ἐν τοῖν δυοῖν ὀβολοῖν ἐθεώρουν ἄν), and it may therefore appear impossible that the theoricon should have been augmented. But we gather from Ulpian (*l. c.*) and Harpocration (*s. v.* θεωρικά, quoting Philinus) that the money thus distributed was intended to provide not only a seat in the theatre, but also a meal to celebrate the holiday. It therefore appears that the ground on which the extension of the theoricon was made was that of helping the citizens to enjoy the great festivals thoroughly.

A further problem is suggested by the mention of the name of Callicrates. There was a proverb current at Athens, ὑπὲρ τὰ Καλλικράτους,

πρῶτος· καὶ χρόνον μέν τινα διεδίδοτο, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα κατέλυσε Καλλικράτης Παιανιεὺς πρῶτος ὑποσχόμενος ἐπιθήσειν πρὸς τοῖν δυοῖν ὀβολοῖν ἄλλον ὀβολόν. τούτων μὲν οὖν ἀμφοτέρων θάνατον κατέγνωσαν ὕστερον· εἴωθεν γάρ, κἂν ἐξαπατηθῇ τὸ πλῆθος, ὕστερον μισεῖν τούς τι προαγαγόντας
4 *ποιεῖν αὐτοὺς τῶν μὴ καλῶς ἐχόντων. ἀπὸ δὲ Κλεοφῶντος ἤδη διεδέχοντο συνεχῶς τὴν δημαγωγίαν οἱ μάλιστα βουλόμενοι θρασύνεσθαι καὶ χαρίζεσθαι τοῖς πολλοῖς πρὸς τὰ παραυτίκα βλέποντες.*
5 *δοκοῦσι δὲ βέλτιστοι γεγονέναι τῶν Ἀθήνησι*

27. *διεδίδοτο*: so Wyse, Richards, K-W., H-L., Ferrini. MS. *διεδιδου*. 31. *κἂν*: H-L. *ἐάν*. 32. *προαγαγόντας*: it is not clear whether this or *προσαγαγόντας* (1st ed.) is the MS. reading. There is no *σ* visible, but there is a wide space between the *ο* and the *α*. 36. *τά*: H-L. *τό*, after Kontos and Gennadios. 37. *δέ*: so corrected in MS. from *δ οι*. *Ἀθήνησι*: MS. *αθηνηισι*, *cf.* Meisterhans, p. 114.

used in the case of anything exceeding all reasonable measure; and Zenobius (VI. 29) quotes in illustration of it from the present treatise, Ἀριστοτέλης δέ φησιν ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ Καλλικράτην τινὰ πρῶτον τῶν δικαστῶν τοὺς μισθοὺς εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αὐξῆσαι, ὅθεν καὶ τὴν παροιμίαν εἰρῆσθαι (Rose, *Frag.* 422). No such passage occurs in the treatise as it stands at present, and the coincidence of the name Callicrates may suggest that this is the place referred to. But, if so, it is certain that Zenobius completely misunderstood it, since it is unquestionable, as shown above, that the pay of the dicasts had been raised to three obols long before the time of Callicrates, and there would moreover have been no great absurdity in proposing to raise their stipend from two to three obols. As, however, it appears from the words of Zenobius that Aristotle actually quoted the proverb in question, it seems certain that his reference, if correct, is to some passage contained in the mutilated portion of the MS. It should be noted, as Dr. Sandys has pointed out, that another version is given in Zenobius, Photius, and Suidas of the origin of the proverb, derived from Clearchus, who states that it arose in Carystus and was applied to excessive wealth. This, however, does not affect the citation from Aristotle, who is represented as having assigned it an Athenian origin, and as having explained it from Athenian politics.

28. *κατέλυσε*: not 'abolished the theoricon,' but 'overthrew Cleophon,' *sc.* by outbidding him.

μὲν οὖν ἄλλα πάντα διῴκουν οὐχ ὁμοίως καὶ πρότερον τοῖς νόμοις προσέχοντες, τὴν δὲ τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων αἵρεσιν οὐκ ἐκίνουν, ἀλλ' ἕκτῳ ἔτει μετὰ τὸν Ἐφιάλτου θάνατον ἔγνωσαν καὶ ἐκ ζευγιτῶν προκρίνεσθαι τοὺς κληρωσομένους τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων, καὶ πρῶτος ἦρξεν ἐξ αὐτῶν Μνησιθείδης. οἱ δὲ πρὸ τούτου πάντες ἐξ ἱππέων καὶ πεντακοσιομεδίμνων ἦσαν, οἱ ⟨δὲ⟩ ζευγῖται τὰς ἐγκυκλίους ἦρχον, εἰ μή τι παρεωρᾶτο τῶν ἐν τοῖς νόμοις. ἔτει 3

14. Ferrini, following Wyse, omits *οὐχ*, but the change does not appear to improve the sense. 16. *ἐκίνουν*: MS. *εκεινουν*. *ἀλλ'*: H-L. *ἀλλ' ἤ*, after Blass. 21. *οἱ δὲ ζευγῖται*: MS. om. *δέ*. 22. *τῶν ἐν τοῖς νόμοις*: before these words the MS. originally had the phrase *ὑπὸ τῶν δήμων*, but it has been erased, not accidentally smudged, as H-L. believe; H-L. retain the words, after Paton, who thinks the correction erroneous.

16. *ἕκτῳ ἔτει μετὰ τὸν Ἐφιάλτου θάνατον*: as the final victory of Ephialtes over the Areopagus occurred in 462 B.C. (*cf. supr.*), and the archonship of Mnesitheides falls in 457 B.C., it follows that the murder of Ephialtes must have taken place in the same year as the former event.

17. *καὶ ἐκ ζευγιτῶν*: it is practically certain that originally only the pentacosiomedimni were eligible to the archonship (*cf. supr.*, note on ch. 7, l. 13), but it has generally been supposed, on the authority of Plutarch (*Arist.* 22), that after the Persian wars the archonship was thrown open to all classes without distinction. The more precise statements of Aristotle must overrule the account of Plutarch, and it must be taken for certain that the *ζευγῖται* were not admitted to this office until the date here named, and that the thetes were never legally qualified for it at all, though in practice they were admitted in the time of Aristotle and probably much earlier (*cf.* ch. 7, ll. 34–36). There is no direct evidence to show when the *ἱππεῖς* became eligible, but it may very likely have been at the time indicated by Plutarch, when there also must have been an admission of the lower classes to some of the inferior magistracies, which Plutarch confused with the archonship.

21. *τὰς ἐγκυκλίους*: *i.e.* the inferior magistracies.

22. *εἰ μή τι παρεωρᾶτο*: this seems to mean that although only members of the first two classes were legally eligible to the archonship, yet occasionally persons not so qualified were allowed to slip in; just as in later times persons not possessing even the qualification of a *ζευγίτης* were elected archons by a notorious legal fiction. It is possible that the phrase *ὑπὸ τῶν δήμων*, which has been erased in the

δὲ πέμπτῳ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπὶ Λυσικράτους ἄρχοντος οἱ τριάκοντα δικασταὶ κατέστησαν πάλιν οἱ καλούμενοι 4 *κατὰ δήμους· καὶ τρίτῳ μετὰ τοῦτον ἐπὶ Ἀντιδότου διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πολιτῶν, Περικλέους εἰπόντος, ἔγνωσαν μὴ μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως ὃς ἂν μὴ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἀστοῖν ᾖ γεγονώς.*

27. *Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ δημαγωγεῖν ἐλθόντος*

25. *μετὰ τοῦτον*: so corrected in the MS., as K-W. have pointed out, from *μετ αυτον*, which H-L. give, after 1st ed. J. E. B. Mayor proposes to add *ἔτει* after *τοῦτον*. 28. *ᾖ*: MS. *ην*.

MS. after these words, should stand, in which case it indicates that the preliminary selection of candidates for the archonship was held by the demes. *Cf.* note on ch. 22, l. 28.

23. *ἐπὶ Λυσικράτους ἄρχοντος*: *i.e.* 453 B.C.

οἱ τριάκοντα δικασταί: *cf.* ch. 53, l. 1. These officials were judges of assize for local cases, and were established by Pisistratus (ch. 16, l. 16).

25. *ἐπὶ Ἀντιδότου*: *i.e.* 451 B.C.

XXVII. 1. *Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ δημαγωγεῖν ἐλθόντος Περικλέους*: it is noticeable that Aristotle does not consider Pericles to have been a leader in the democratic party till about 450 B.C., but he must have been taking a considerable share in politics much earlier. The date of his accusation of Cimon, which Aristotle mentions as his first important public appearance, is not fixed. Plutarch states that Cimon was brought to trial on a charge of bribery after his return from the reduction of Thasos, and that Pericles was the most active of his prosecutors (*Cim.* 14). This would put the date in 463 B.C. (457 B.C. Bauer), which is quite possible. Pericles was then young (*νέος ὤν*), and it was his first prominent act in public life; and though he no doubt supported Ephialtes and Themistocles in their attack on the Areopagus, he could not be called a leader of his party till several years later. At the same time it must be observed that Aristotle proceeds in the next chapter to say that he established the system of payment for services in the law-courts *ἀντιδημαγωγῶν πρὸς τὴν Κίμωνος εὐπορίαν*. Cimon died in 449 B.C., so that this important step, which shows Pericles as a leader of the people, must have occurred several years before that date. We know that he was commander of an expedition in the Crissaean Gulf in 454 B.C. (Thuc. I. 111), and it will not be going far wrong to date the ascendancy of Pericles in Athens from a year or two before that date. The murder of Ephialtes and banishment of Themistocles left the way clear for him.

*Περικλέους, καὶ πρῶτον εὐδοκιμήσαντος ὅτε κατη-
γόρησε τὰς εὐθύνας Κίμωνος στρατηγοῦντος νέος
ὤν, δημοτικωτέραν ἔτι συνέβη γενέσθαι τὴν πολι-
τείαν· καὶ γὰρ τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν ἔνια παρείλετο,
καὶ μάλιστα προὔτρεψεν τὴν πόλιν ἐπὶ τὴν ναυτικὴν
δύναμιν, ἐξ ἧς συνέβη θαρρήσαντας τοὺς πολλοὺς
ἅπασαν τὴν πολιτείαν μᾶλλον ἄγειν εἰς αὑτούς.
μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχίαν ἑνὸς δεῖν πεντη-* 2
*κοστῷ ἔτει ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρ[ου] ἄρχοντος ὁ πρὸς Πελο-
ποννησίους ἐνέστη πόλεμος, ἐν ᾧ κατακλεισθεὶς ὁ
δῆμος ἐν τῷ ἄστει καὶ συνεθισθεὶς ἐν ταῖς στρατείαις
μισθοφορεῖν, τὰ μὲν ἑκὼν τὰ δὲ ἄκων προῃρεῖτο
τὴν πολιτείαν διοικεῖν αὐτός. ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ μισθο-* 3
*φόρα τὰ δικαστήρια Περικλῆς πρῶτος, ἀντιδημαγω-
γῶν πρὸς τὴν Κίμωνος εὐπορίαν. ὁ γὰρ Κίμων, ἅτε*

XXVII. 2. πρῶτον: MS. πρωτου. 4. ἔτι: wrongly altered to επι in MS. 5. παρείλετο: K-W. περιείλετο; *cf.* 25, ll. 11, 29. 9. δεῖν: MS. δει, which H-L. retain; *cf.* 19, l. 49. 11. ἐνέστη: H-L. συνέστη, but *cf.* 5, ll. 12, 25; 17, l. 19; 41, l. 3, in all of which places H-L. substitute or suggest συν. κατακλεισθείς: MS. κατακλισθεις. 12. στρατείαις: MS. στρατιαις.

5. τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν ἔνια παρείλετο: this may mean either that Pericles assisted to some extent in Ephialtes' proceedings for stripping the Areopagus of its power, or that he carried the same movement further after the death of Ephialtes. In either case it is consistent with his not having taken a leading part in the great struggle.

9. ἑνὸς δεῖν πεντηκοστῷ ἔτει: the date of the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war is of course as well fixed as any date in Greek history. Pythodorus was archon in 432 B.C., which is the 49th year after Salamis, and Thucydides (II. 2) tells us that he had only four months of his archonship still to run at the time of the Theban attack on Plataea, which fixes the date in the spring of 431 B.C.

14. ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ μισθοφόρα τὰ δικαστήρια Περικλῆς πρῶτος: this confirms the passage in the *Politics* (II. 12), τὰ δὲ δικαστήρια μισθοφόρα κατέστησε Περικλῆς. *Cf.* Plat. *Gorg.* 515 E (cited by Prof. Mayor, *Class. Rev.* V. 121), ταυτὶ γὰρ ἔγωγε ἀκούω, Περικλέα πεποιηκέναι Ἀθηναίους ἀργοὺς καὶ δειλοὺς καὶ λάλους καὶ φιλαργύρους, εἰς μισθοφορίαν πρῶτον καταστήσαντα.

τυραννικὴν ἔχων οὐσίαν, πρῶτον μὲν τὰς κοινὰς λητουργίας ἐλητούργει λαμπρῶς, ἔπειτα τῶν δημοτῶν ἔτρεφε πολλούς· ἐξῆν γὰρ τῷ βουλομένῳ Λακιαδῶν καθʼ ἑκάστην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐλθόντι παρʼ αὐτὸν ἔχειν τὰ μέτρια, ἔτι δὲ τὰ χωρία πάντα ἄφρακτα ἦν, ὅπως ἐξῇ τῷ βουλομένῳ τῆς ὀπώρας ἀπολαύειν.
4 πρὸς δὴ ταύτην τὴν χορηγίαν ἐπιλειπόμενος ὁ Περικλῆς τῇ οὐσίᾳ, συμβουλεύσαντος αὐτῷ Δαμωνίδου τοῦ Οἰῆθεν (ὃς ἐδόκει τῶν πολλῶν

19. *πολλούς*: the MS. originally had *τούς* before this, but the article is erased. Paton would restore it. 22. *ἐξῇ*: MS. *εξην*. *Cf.* *ην* for *ηι*, 26, l. 28. 23. *ἐπιλειπόμενος*: H-L. *ἀπολειπόμενος*, after Richards and Kontos; *cf.* 20, l. 6. 25. *ὅς*: MS. *ους*. *πολλῶν*: H-L., Wyse, Gennadios, Poland *πολιτικῶν*, reading MS. as *πολέμων* (as 1st ed.).

18. *λητουργίας ἐλητούργει*: this spelling is supported by inscriptions of the fourth century (C. I. A. II. add. 554, b, 14; 557, 5, 6; 172, 4). On the other hand *κατακλεισθείς* above (l. 11) is rightly spelt with *ει*, since with *κλῄς* and its compounds the later spelling is established by about 380 B.C. *Cf.* Meisterhans, pp. 28–30.

20. *Λακιαδῶν*: Plutarch (*Cim.* 10) quotes Aristotle (though without specifying the precise work) as authority for this fact, in opposition to the story that Cimon kept open house for the whole of the poorer population of Athens (Rose, *Frag.* 363). *Cf.* also *Per.* 9, which reproduces the substance of the present passage.

24. *συμβουλεύσαντος κ.τ.λ.*: quoted by Plutarch (*Per.* 9), *τρέπεται πρὸς τὴν τῶν δημοσίων διανομήν, συμβουλεύσαντος αὐτῷ Δαμωνίδου τοῦ Οἰῆθεν, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης ἱστόρηκεν* (Rose, *Frag.* 365).

25. *Δαμωνίδου τοῦ Οἰῆθεν*: it has been proposed by Mr. Wyse (following Oncken on Plut. *Per.* 9) to prefix *Δάμωνος*, on the strength of Plut. *Per.* 4, *Nic.* 6, *Arist.* 1, where Damon the musician is spoken of as Pericles' adviser; but it would be flying in the face of all rational criticism to alter the text, when not only is the article after *Δαμωνίδου* irregular if *Δάμωνος* precedes (as Mr. Wyse himself admits), but also Plutarch himself, though elsewhere speaking of *Δάμων*, here, in avowedly quoting Aristotle, has *Δαμωνίδης*. This is clear evidence that Aristotle spoke of Damonides and not of Damon, and the only question is what bearing this has on the passages in Plutarch where Damon is mentioned. Plutarch (*Per.* 4) says that Damon's music was a mere blind, and that he was a cunning sophist who associated with Pericles *καθάπερ ἀθλητῇ τῶν πολιτικῶν ἀλείπτης καὶ διδάσκαλος*; in spite of which he was found out and ostracised *ὡς μεγαλοπράγμων καὶ φιλο-*

*εἰσηγητὴς εἶναι τῷ Περικλεῖ, διὸ καὶ ὠστράκισαν
αὐτὸν ὕστερον), ἐπεὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις ἡττᾶτο, διδόναι τοῖς
πολλοῖς τὰ αὑτῶν, κατεσκεύασε μισθοφορὰν τοῖς
δικασταῖς· ἀφʼ ὧν αἰτιῶνταί τινες χείρω γενέσθαι,
κληρουμένων ἐπιμελῶς ἀεὶ μᾶλλον τῶν τυχόντων
ἢ τῶν ἐπιεικῶν ἀνθρώπων. ἤρξατο δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα* 5
*καὶ τὸ δεκάζειν, πρώτου καταδείξαντος Ἀνύτου μετὰ
τὴν ἐν Πύλῳ στρατηγίαν. κρινόμενος γὰρ ὑπό
τινων διὰ τὸ ἀποβαλεῖν Πύλον, δεκάσας τὸ δικαστή-
ριον ἀπέφυγεν.*

28. *Ἕως μὲν οὖν Περικλῆς προειστήκει τοῦ
δήμου βελτίω τὰ κατὰ τὴν πολιτείαν ἦν, τελευτή-
σαντος δὲ Περικλέους πολὺ χείρω. πρῶτον γὰρ* 2
*τότε προστάτην ἔλαβεν ὁ δῆμος οὐκ εὐδοκιμοῦντα
παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιεικέσιν· ἐν δὲ τοῖς πρότερον χρόνοις
ἀεὶ διετέλουν οἱ ἐπιεικεῖς δημαγωγοῦντες. ἐξ ἀρχῆς
μὲν γὰρ καὶ πρῶτος ἐγένετο προστάτης τοῦ δήμου*

29. δικασταῖς: H-L. δικαστηρίοις, after Blass and Richards, to justify χείρω which follows. ὧν: H-L. οὗ, after Richards. χείρω: K-W. χείρους. Rutherford, J. B. Mayor, Ferrini and Bury insert τὰ κατὰ τὴν πολιτείαν or equivalent phrases, but it is not easy to explain such an omission, and the sense of the passage is clear as it stands. 32. Ἀνύτου: MS. αυτου. XXVIII. 2. βελτίω: MS. βελτειω. 4. εὐδοκιμοῦντα: MS. ευδοκιμουμενοντα, with -ντα written above as a correction; the letters -μενοντα, which should have been struck out, remain uncancelled.

τύραννος, or (*Arist.* 1) ὅτι τὸ φρονεῖν ἐδόκει τις εἶναι περιττός. This does not sound very probable as history, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that Plutarch confused two persons, Damon the son of Damonides, apparently of the deme Ὄα (so Wyse, quoting Steph. Byz. *s. v.* Ὄα, Δάμων Δαμωνίδου Ὄαθεν), and Damonides of the deme Οἴη. The former was a musician, the latter a politician, and Plutarch has transferred to the former a portion of the attributes of the latter. *Cf.* also Gomperz, *Deutsche Rundschau*, May 1891, p. 232.

32. καταδείξαντος Ἀνύτου κ.τ.λ.: this passage is referred to by Harpocration (*s. v.* δεκάζων), Ἀριστοτέλης δʼ ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ Ἄνυτόν φησι καταδεῖξαι τὸ δεκάζειν τὰ δικαστήρια (Rose, *Frag.* 371).

XXVIII. 7. προστάτης τοῦ δήμου: the way in which Aristotle uses this

Σόλων, δεύτερος δὲ Πεισίστρατος, τῶν εὐγενῶν καὶ γνωρίμων· καταλυθείσης δὲ τῆς τυραννίδος Κλεισθένης, τοῦ γένους ὢν τῶν Ἀλκμεωνιδῶν, καὶ τούτῳ μὲν οὐδεὶς ἦν ἀντιστασιώτης ὡς ἐξέπεσον οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἰσαγόραν. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τοῦ μὲν δήμου προειστήκει Ξάνθιππος, τῶν δὲ γνωρίμων Μιλτιάδης· ἔπειτα Θεμιστοκλῆς καὶ Ἀριστείδης· μετὰ δὲ τούτους Ἐφιάλτης μὲν τοῦ δήμου, Κίμων δ' ὁ Μιλτιάδου τῶν εὐπόρων· εἶτα Περικλῆς μὲν τοῦ δήμου, Θουκυδίδης δὲ τῶν ἑτέρων, κηδεστὴς ὢν Κίμωνος.
3 Περικλέους δὲ τελευτήσαντος τῶν μὲν ἐπιφανῶν προειστήκει Νικίας, ὁ ἐν Σικελίᾳ τελευτήσας, τοῦ δὲ δήμου Κλέων ὁ Κλεαινέτου, ὃς δοκεῖ μάλιστα διαφθεῖραι τὸν δῆμον ταῖς ὁρμαῖς, καὶ πρῶτος ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἀνέκραγε καὶ ἐλοιδορήσατο

8. *τῶν εὐγενῶν καὶ γνωρίμων*: bracketed by K-W.; H-L. (after Richards) insert *ὢν* after *εὐγενῶν*. 10. *Ἀλκμεωνιδῶν*: MS. *αλκμεονιδων*. 20. *Κλεαινέτου*: MS. *κλαιενετου*.

title shows that it had become a technical phrase indicating a definite position, but it does not support the view of those who hold it to have been an office to which there was a regular appointment. The most that it proves is that the popular party in the assembly recognised one individual as its especial leader at any given time, and that he was accepted by the world at large as the representative of that party for the time being. The fact that Solon and Pisistratus and Cleisthenes are spoken of in precisely the same way as Cleon and Cleophon is enough to prove this; and it may further be noticed that Miltiades, Cimon, and Thucydides are represented as holding exactly the same position in reference to the *εὔποροι* or *γνώριμοι* as their rivals have in reference to the *δῆμος*.

8. *τῶν εὐγενῶν καὶ γνωρίμων*: these words are bracketed by K-W., presumably as having been added by some one who thought Pisistratus was represented as the head of the opposite party to Solon. If they are genuine they emphasise the fact stated in the preceding sentence, by pointing out that both Solon and Pisistratus, though *προστάται τοῦ δήμου*, belonged to the upper classes.

καὶ περιζωσάμενος ἐδημηγόρησε, τῶν ἄλλων ἐν κόσμῳ λεγόντων. εἶτα μετὰ τούτους τῶν μὲν ἑτέρων Θηραμένης ὁ Ἅγνωνος, τοῦ δὲ δήμου Κλεοφῶν ὁ λυροποιός, ὃς καὶ τὴν διωβελίαν ἐπόρισε

26. διωβελίαν: MS. διωβολιαν.

23. περιζωσάμενος: the scholiast to Lucian (*Tim.* 30) refers to Aristotle for this fact, Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ καὶ περιζωσάμενον αὐτὸν λέγει δημηγορῆσαι, εἰς τὴν θρασύτητα αὐτοῦ ἀποσκώπτων. This is given by Neumann in his edition of the fragments (*Frag.* 33), but Rose adopts another reading of the passage, which assigns Aristotle's authority instead to a statement that Cleon obstructed the making of peace with Sparta (*Frag.* 368). The scholiast to Aeschines (Dindorf, p. 14) uses nearly the same words, λέγεται δὲ Κλέων ὁ δημαγωγὸς παραβὰς τὸ ἐξ ἔθους σχῆμα περιζωσάμενος δημηγορῆσαι.

26. τὴν διωβελίαν: this cannot refer either to the payment for attendance at the ecclesia, which we know from ch. 41 to have been instituted by Agyrrhius and Heracleides, nor to that for service in the courts, which it is certain from Aristophanes had been raised to three obols long before the time of Cleophon (*Knights*, 51, 255; *Wasps*, 609, 684, 690). The διωβελία *par excellence* was the same as the theoricon, the payment to the populace of the price of admission to the theatre. This, however, is generally assigned to Pericles, on the authority of Plutarch (*Pericl.* 9) and Ulpian (on Demosthenes' *Olynth.* I). The authority nevertheless is not convincing. Plutarch speaks somewhat generally (θεωρικοῖς καὶ δικαστικοῖς λήμμασιν ἄλλαις τε μισθοφοραῖς καὶ χορηγίαις συνδεκάσας τὸ πλῆθος), and his accuracy is not to be trusted in such details; in fact, in the same chapter he speaks of Pericles as the chief agent in the overthrow of the Areopagus. It therefore seems best to take the word here in its natural sense, and to suppose that the diobelia was first established by Cleophon and augmented by Callicrates to three obols. There are, however, still some difficulties to be explained. It is evident from Demosthenes that the price of seats at the theatre continued to be two obols (*de Cor.* p. 234, ἐν τοῖν δυοῖν ὀβολοῖν ἐθεώρουν ἄν), and it may therefore appear impossible that the theoricon should have been augmented. But we gather from Ulpian (*l. c.*) and Harpocration (*s. v.* θεωρικά, quoting Philinus) that the money thus distributed was intended to provide not only a seat in the theatre, but also a meal to celebrate the holiday. It therefore appears that the ground on which the extension of the theoricon was made was that of helping the citizens to enjoy the great festivals thoroughly.

A further problem is suggested by the mention of the name of Callicrates. There was a proverb current at Athens, ὑπὲρ τὰ Καλλικράτους,

πρῶτος· καὶ χρόνον μέν τινα διεδίδοτο, μετὰ δὲ
ταῦτα κατέλυσε Καλλικράτης Παιανιεὺς πρῶτος
ὑποσχόμενος ἐπιθήσειν πρὸς τοῖν δυοῖν ὀβολοῖν
ἄλλον ὀβολόν. τούτων μὲν οὖν ἀμφοτέρων θάνατον
κατέγνωσαν ὕστερον· εἴωθεν γάρ, κἂν ἐξαπατηθῇ
τὸ πλῆθος, ὕστερον μισεῖν τούς τι προαγαγόντας
4 *ποιεῖν αὐτοὺς τῶν μὴ καλῶς ἐχόντων. ἀπὸ δὲ*
Κλεοφῶντος ἤδη διεδέχοντο συνεχῶς τὴν δημαγω-
γίαν οἱ μάλιστα βουλόμενοι θρασύνεσθαι καὶ χαρί-
ζεσθαι τοῖς πολλοῖς πρὸς τὰ παραυτίκα βλέποντες.
5 *δοκοῦσι δὲ βέλτιστοι γεγονέναι τῶν Ἀθήνησι*

27. *διεδίδοτο*: so Wyse, Richards, K-W., H-L., Ferrini. MS. *διεδιδου*. 31. *κἂν*: H-L. *ἐάν*. 32. *προαγαγόντας*: it is not clear whether this or *προσαγαγόντας* (1st ed.) is the MS. reading. There is no *σ* visible, but there is a wide space between the *ο* and the *α*. 36. *τά*: H-L. *τό*, after Kontos and Gennadios. 37. *δέ*: so corrected in MS. from *δ οι*. *Ἀθήνησι*: MS. *αθηνηισι*, *cf.* Meisterhans, p. 114.

used in the case of anything exceeding all reasonable measure; and Zenobius (VI. 29) quotes in illustration of it from the present treatise, *Ἀριστοτέλης δέ φησιν ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ Καλλικράτην τινὰ πρῶτον τῶν δικαστῶν τοὺς μισθοὺς εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αὐξῆσαι, ὅθεν καὶ τὴν παροιμίαν εἰρῆσθαι* (Rose, *Frag.* 422). No such passage occurs in the treatise as it stands at present, and the coincidence of the name Callicrates may suggest that this is the place referred to. But, if so, it is certain that Zenobius completely misunderstood it, since it is unquestionable, as shown above, that the pay of the dicasts had been raised to three obols long before the time of Callicrates, and there would moreover have been no great absurdity in proposing to raise their stipend from two to three obols. As, however, it appears from the words of Zenobius that Aristotle actually quoted the proverb in question, it seems certain that his reference, if correct, is to some passage contained in the mutilated portion of the MS. It should be noted, as Dr. Sandys has pointed out, that another version is given in Zenobius, Photius, and Suidas of the origin of the proverb, derived from Clearchus, who states that it arose in Carystus and was applied to excessive wealth. This, however, does not affect the citation from Aristotle, who is represented as having assigned it an Athenian origin, and as having explained it from Athenian politics.

28. *κατέλυσε*: not 'abolished the theoricon,' but 'overthrew Cleophon,' *sc.* by outbidding him.

πολιτευσαμένων μετὰ τοὺς ἀρχαίους Νικίας καὶ Θουκυδίδης καὶ Θηραμένης· καὶ περὶ μὲν Νικίου καὶ Θουκυδίδου πάντες σχεδὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν ἄνδρας γεγονέναι οὐ μόνον καλοὺς κἀγαθοὺς ἀλλὰ καὶ πολιτικοὺς καὶ τῇ πόλει πάσῃ πατρικῶς χρωμένους, περὶ δὲ Θηραμένους διὰ τὸ συμβῆναι κατ' αὐτὸν ταραχώδεις τὰς πολιτείας ἀμφισβήτησις τῆς κρίσεώς ἐστι. δοκεῖ μέντοι τοῖς μὴ παρέργως ἀποφαινομένοις οὐχ ὥσπερ αὐτὸν διαβάλλουσι πάσας τὰς πολιτείας καταλύειν, ἀλλὰ πάσας προάγειν ἕως μηδὲν παρανομοῖεν, ὡς δυνάμενος πολιτεύεσθαι κατὰ πάσας, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀγαθοῦ πολίτου ἔργον, παρανομούσαις δὲ οὐ συγχωρῶν ἀλλ' ἀπεχθανόμενος.

29. *Ἕως μὲν οὖν ἰσόρροπα τὰ πράγματα κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον ἦν διεφ[ύλαττον] τὴν δημοκρατίαν. ἐπεὶ δὲ μετὰ τὴν ἐν Σικελίᾳ γενομένην συμφορὰν*

38. *πολιτευσαμένων*: MS. *πολειτευσαμενων*. 42. *πατρικῶς*: over this word in the MS. *καλως* has been written; but the parallel passage in Plutarch (*Nic.* 2) has the phrase *πατρικὴν ἔχοντες εὔνοιαν*, and *καλῶς* was no doubt intended as an explanation of a somewhat uncommon word, not as a correction. 44. *ταραχώδεις*: K-W. supply *εἶναι* after this word, H-L. after *πολιτείας*, following Richards. 45. *μέντοι*: MS. *μεν*, but there is no corresponding *δέ*, and the omission of *τοι* is easily explained by the following *τοις*. K-W. omit *τοῖς*, simply altering the MS. *μεντοις* into *μέντοι*, but the retention of the article seems preferable. XXIX. 1. *ἰσόρροπα*: MS. *ισοροπα*. *Cf.* 30, l. 42, *προρηθεισαν*, and see Meisterhans, pp. 72, 73. *πράγματα*: om. H-L. 3. *συμφοράν*: so Richards, K-W., H-L.; MS. *διαφοραν*. *διαφθοράν* would be a simpler correction, but is a less probable word.

38. *Νικίας καὶ Θουκυδίδης καὶ Θηραμένης*: this passage is referred to by Plutarch (*Nic.* 2), *ἔνεστιν οὖν περὶ Νικίου πρῶτον εἰπεῖν ὃ γέγραφεν Ἀριστοτέλης, ὅτι τρεῖς ἐγένοντο βέλτιστοι τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ πατρικὴν ἔχοντες εὔνοιαν καὶ φιλίαν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον, Νικίας ὁ Νικηράτου καὶ Θουκυδίδης ὁ Μελησίου καὶ Θηραμένης ὁ Ἅγνωνος* (Rose, *Frag.* 369). This judgment shows with some clearness the political prepossessions of Aristotle; but his statement that nearly everyone was of one mind as to the merits of Nicias and Thucydides is somewhat noticeable. As to Theramenes, it is clear from Aristotle's own defence of him here that he was simply an Opportunist with aristocratical sympathies.

ἰσχυρότατα τὰ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ἐγένετο διὰ τὴν πρὸς βασιλέα συμμαχίαν, ἠναγκάσθησαν με[ταστή-σα]ντες τὴν δημοκρατίαν καταστῆσαι τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν τετρακοσίων πολιτείαν, εἰπό[ντο]ς τὸν μὲν πρὸ τοῦ ψηφίσματος λόγον Μηλοβίου, τὴν δὲ γνώμην γράψαντος Πυθοδώρου το[ῦ Πολυζήλ]ου, μάλιστα δὲ συμπεισθέντων τῶν πολλῶν διὰ τὸ νομίζειν βασιλέα [μᾶλλο]ν ἑαυτοῖς συμπολεμήσειν ἐὰν δι' ὀλίγων
2 *ποιήσωνται τὴν πολιτείαν. ἦν δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα τοῦ* [Col. 12.] *Πυθοδώρου τοιόνδε· τὸν δῆμον ἑλέσθαι μετὰ τῶν προϋπαρχόντων δέκα προβούλων ἄλλους εἴκοσι ἐκ*

4. *ἰσχυρότατα* : J. B. Mayor, Blass, H-L., K-W. *ἰσχυρότερα*. 5. *μεταστήσαντες* : H-L. *μεταβαλόντες*, after Hultsch; K-W. *κινήσαντες*, believing the first letters to be *κε*, which is not impossible. 9. Πολυζήλου : so Poland, followed by H-L., from Diog. Laert. IX. 8, § 5, *Πυθόδωρος Πολυζήλου, εἷς τῶν τετρακοσίων*. K-W. Ἐπιζήλου. It is doubtful whether the remains in the MS. suit these; K-W. believe ζ to be legible, H-L. and K-W.[2] ζηλ. 11. *μᾶλλον* : so J. B. Mayor, followed by K-W.; *μέλλειν* Marchant, *θᾶττον* H-L., *ἄσμενον* 1st ed., but the remains in the MS. rather support *μᾶλλον*.

XXIX. 8. Μηλοβίου : probably the same as the Melobius who was afterwards one of the Thirty; he was one of the party sent to arrest Lysias and Polemarchus (Lysias *contr. Erat.* § 13, p. 121).

10. *συμπεισθέντων κ.τ.λ.* : *cf. Pol.* VIII. (V.) 4, p. 1304[b] 12, *οἷον ἐπὶ τῶν τετρακοσίων τὸν δῆμον ἐξηπάτησαν, φάσκοντες τὸν βασιλέα χρήματα παρέξειν πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον.*

13. *τῶν προϋπαρχόντων δέκα προβούλων* : Thucydides (VIII. 67) speaks of ten persons being elected as *συγγραφεῖς αὐτοκράτορες*, but says nothing of the additional twenty mentioned by Aristotle. The latter is, however, supported by Philochorus and Androtion, as appears from Harpocration (*s. v. συγγραφεῖς*), who after quoting the words of Thucydides adds *ἦσαν δὲ οἱ μὲν πάντες συγγραφεῖς λ̄ οἱ τότε αἱρεθέντες, καθά φησιν Ἀνδροτίων τε καὶ Φιλόχορος, ἑκάτερος ἐν τῇ Ἀτθίδι· ὁ δὲ Θουκυδίδης τῶν ῑ ἐμνημόνευσε μόνων τῶν προβούλων.* From Aristotle's account it would appear that there was an existing board of ten *πρόβουλοι*, which was probably the continuation of that which was first appointed after the news of the Sicilian disaster (Thuc. VIII. 1); and to this twenty additional members were elected for the special purpose on hand. That Thucydides and Aristotle are speaking of the same body is clear from their accounts of the work done by it, as well as from the words of Harpocration.

τῶν ὑπὲρ τετταράκοντα ἔτη γεγονότων, οἵτινες ὀμόσαντες ἦ μὴν συγγράψειν ἃ ἂν ἡγῶνται βέλτιστα εἶναι τῇ πόλει συγγράψουσι περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας· ἐξεῖναι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῷ βουλομένῳ γράφειν, ἵν' ἐξ ἁπάντων αἱρῶνται τὸ ἄριστον. Κλειτοφῶν δὲ 3
τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ Πυθόδωρος εἶπεν, προσαναζητῆσαι δὲ τοὺς αἱρεθέντας ἔγραψεν καὶ τοὺς πατρίους νόμους οὓς Κλεισθένης ἔθηκεν ὅτε καθίστη τὴν δημοκρατίαν, ὅπως ἀκούσαντες καὶ τούτων βουλεύσωνται τὸ ἄριστον, ὡς οὐ δημοτικὴν ἀλλὰ παραπλησίαν οὖσαν τὴν Κλεισθένους πολιτείαν τῇ Σόλωνος. οἱ δ' αἱρεθέντες πρῶτον μὲν ἔγραψαν 4
ἐπάναγκες εἶναι τοὺς πρυτάνεις ἅπαντα τὰ λεγόμενα περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας ἐπιψηφίζειν, ἔπειτα τὰς τῶν παρανόμων γραφὰς καὶ τὰς εἰσαγγελίας καὶ τὰς προσκλήσεις ἀνεῖλον, ὅπως ἂν οἱ ἐθέλοντες Ἀθηναίων συμβουλεύωσι περὶ τῶν προκειμένων· ἐὰν δέ τις τούτων χάριν ἢ ζημιοῖ ἢ προσκαλῆται ἢ εἰσάγῃ εἰς δικαστήριον, ἔνδειξιν αὐτοῦ εἶναι καὶ ἀπαγωγὴν πρὸς τοὺς στρατηγούς, τοὺς δὲ στρατηγοὺς παραδοῦναι

17. *συγγράψουσι*: Rutherford and H-L. *συμβουλεύσουσι*. 19. *τὸ ἄριστον*: there is a single stroke following *το* in the MS., which looks as if the copyist had begun to write *τον*, but had seen that it was wrong before completing the word. H-L. erroneously refer this remark to l. 24, where *τὸ ἄριστον* recurs. 23. *ὅπως . . . βουλεύσωνται*: K-W. insert *ἂν* after *ὅπως*, H-L. read *βουλεύσονται*; *cf.* l. 30, and Meisterhans, p. 212. 30. *προσκλήσεις*: so Wyse, Blass, K-W., H-L.; MS. *προκλησεις*. 32. *εἰς*: MS. *η εις*, a very intelligible clerical error. H-L. *εἰς τό*.

26. *πρῶτον μὲν ἔγραψαν κ.τ.λ.*: this is substantially the same as the briefer summary of Thucydides (VIII. 67), that the *συγγραφεῖς* proposed nothing except that any Athenian might suggest anything he liked without fear of penalties (*ἐξεῖναι μὲν Ἀθηναίῳ ἀνδρὶ εἰπεῖν γνώμην ἣν ἄν τις βούληται· ἢν δέ τις τὸν εἰπόντα ἢ γράψηται παρανόμων ἢ ἄλλῳ τῳ τρόπῳ βλάψῃ, μεγάλας ζημίας ἐπέθεσαν*).

5 *τοῖς ἕνδεκα θανάτῳ ζημιῶσαι. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τὴν πολιτείαν διέταξαν τόνδε ⟨τὸν⟩ τρόπον· τὰ μὲν χρήματα ⟨τὰ⟩ προσιόντα μὴ ἐξεῖναι ἄλλοσε δαπανῆσαι ἢ εἰς τὸν πόλεμον, τὰς δ' ἀρχὰς ἀμίσθους ἄρχειν ἁπάσας ἕως ἂν ὁ πόλεμος ᾖ, πλὴν τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων καὶ τῶν πρυτανέων οἳ ἂν ὦσιν· τούτους δὲ φέρειν τρεῖς ὀβολοὺς ἕκαστον τῆς ἡμέρας. τὴν δ' ἄλλην πολιτείαν ἐπιτρέψαι πᾶσιν Ἀθηναίων τοῖς δυνατωτάτοις καὶ τοῖς σώμασιν καὶ τοῖς χρήμασιν λῃτουργεῖν μὴ ἔλαττον ἢ πεντακισχιλίοις ἕως ἂν ὁ πόλεμος ᾖ· κυρίους δ' εἶναι τούτους καὶ συνθήκας συντίθεσθαι πρὸς οὓς ἂν ἐθέλωσιν· ἑλέσθαι δὲ καὶ τῆς φυλῆς ἑκάστης δέκα ἄνδρας ὑπὲρ τετταράκοντα ἔτη γεγονότας, οἵτινες καταλέξουσι τοὺς πεντακισχιλίους ὀμόσαντες καθ' ἱερῶν τελείων.*

30. *Οἱ μὲν οὖν αἱρεθέντες ταῦτα συνέγραψαν. κυρωθέντων δὲ τούτων εἵλοντο σφῶν αὐτῶν οἱ*

36. *τόν* : *cf.* 7, l. 10. *χρήματα τὰ προσιόντα* : MS. om. *τά*, an omission easily explained. Richards and H-L. omit *χρήματα* as an adscript. 42. *πᾶσιν* : J. B. Mayor, K-W., H-L., Newman *πᾶσαν*. 44. *πεντακισχιλίοις* : altered in MS. to *πεντακισχιλιων*, the corrector either having overlooked the fact that *ἤ* precedes, or else having omitted to cancel it. K-W. take the latter view. 46. *δὲ καί* : H-L. *δ' ἐκ*.

36. *τὰ μὲν χρήματα κ.τ.λ.* : *cf.* Thucydides (VIII. 65), *λόγος τε . . . προείργαστο αὐτοῖς ὡς οὔτε μισθοφορητέον εἴη ἄλλους ἢ τοὺς στρατευομένους, οὔτε μεθεκτέον τῶν πραγμάτων πλείοσιν ἢ πεντακισχιλίοις, καὶ τούτοις οἳ ἂν μάλιστα τοῖς τε χρήμασι καὶ τοῖς σώμασιν ὠφελεῖν οἷοί τε ὦσιν.*

XXX. 2. *εἵλοντο σφῶν αὐτῶν οἱ πεντακισχίλιοι τοὺς ἀναγράψοντας* : this statement, which is confirmed below (*οἱ ὑπὸ τῶν πεντακισχιλίων αἱρεθέντες*), seems to be in direct contradiction to the assertion in ch. 32, l. 15 that the 5000 *λόγῳ μόνον ᾑρέθησαν*, with which Thucydides agrees (VIII. 92). Probably the body that elected the 100 commissioners here spoken of was of the same kind as that which took over the government after the fall of the Four Hundred, which consisted of all who could furnish arms (Thuc. VIII. 97), though it was nominally Five Thousand. The same may have been the case now. All who could bear arms

πεντακισχίλιοι τοὺς ἀναγράψοντας τὴν πολιτείαν
ἑκατὸν ἄνδρας. οἱ δ' αἱρεθέντες ἀνέγραψαν καὶ
ἐξήνεγκαν τάδε. βουλεύειν μὲν κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν τοὺς 2
ὑπὲρ τριάκοντα ἔτη γεγονότας ἄνευ μισθοφορᾶς·
τούτων δ' εἶναι τοὺς στρατηγοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἐννέα
ἄρχοντας καὶ τὸν ἱερομνήμονα καὶ τοὺς ταξιάρχους
καὶ ἱππάρχους καὶ φυλάρχους καὶ ἄρχοντας εἰς τὰ
φρούρια καὶ ταμίας τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων τῇ θ[εῷ]

were provisionally entitled the Five Thousand until a body of that exact number had been drawn up by the board of 100 which was to be appointed for that purpose. It is clear that the Five Thousand contemplated by the complete constitution planned by the leaders of the revolution were not to be an indefinite body including all persons who could bear arms, but were to be limited to the number mentioned; for in Thuc. VIII. 86 the envoys from the Four Hundred tell the army in Samos that they will all be members of the Five Thousand *in turn*. This body would have required to be carefully drawn up, and till that could be done it seems that all qualified persons were provisionally considered to belong to it, and that they elected the hundred persons here spoken of, who drew up complete schemes alike for the present administration of Athens and for its future constitution. The alternative is to suppose that the 100 commissioners just mentioned drew up a provisional list of the Five Thousand, who thereupon nominated another 100 commissioners to revise the constitution. The Five Thousand would then be only a provisional body, which would require re-election when the constitution was finally drawn up on an authoritative basis. Compare the Convention appointed in 1689 to bridge over the constitutional interregnum between the abdication of James II and the authoritative accession of William and Mary.

7. τούτων: H-L. following Nicklin (*Class. Rev.* V. 228) suggest that this may refer to τοὺς ὑπὲρ τριάκοντα ἔτη γεγονότας, not, as at first sight appears natural, to the members of the Council. This is possible, but one would have expected καί before τούς: moreover, if these officials were not members of the Council, the express exclusion of the hellenotamiae in l. 17 becomes meaningless. Probably they were members, forming an *ex officio* addition to the group whose turn it was to form the Council for the year (*cf.* l. 19 ff.).

10. ταμίας τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων τῇ θεῷ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς: *cf.* Boeckh, *Staatsh.*[3] I. 195 ff., bk. II. 7, with Fraenkel's notes. Every temple at

καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς δέκα καὶ ἑλληνοταμίας καὶ
τῶν ἄλλων ὁσίων χρημάτων ἁπάντων εἴκοσιν οἳ
διαχειριοῦσιν καὶ ἱεροποιοὺς καὶ ἐπιμελητὰς δέκα
ἑκατέρους· αἱρεῖσθαι δὲ πάντας τούτους ἐκ προκρί-
των, ἐκ τῶν ἀεὶ βουλευόντων πλείους προκρίνοντας,
τὰς δ' ἄλλας ἀρχὰς ἁπάσας κληρωτὰς εἶναι καὶ μὴ
ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς· τοὺς δὲ ἑλληνοταμίας οἳ ἂν δια-
3 *χειρίζωσι τὰ χρήματα μὴ συμβουλεύειν. βουλὰς*

17. ἂν: MS. εαν.

Athens had its own treasurers, those of the temple of Athena being far the most important; but in 435 B.C. the various treasurers, with the exception of those of Athena, were united in a single board under the title of *ταμίαι τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν*.

11. *ἑλληνοταμίας*: K-W. consider this passage corrupt, and Richards proposes to read *ταμίας*, presumably omitting the following *καί*. Certainly there is something questionable about the word, since the hellenotamiae are expressly excluded from the Council in l. 17.

καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὁσίων χρημάτων εἴκοσιν: Boeckh (*l. c.*) considers the public money to have been in the keeping of the *ταμίαι τῆς θεοῦ*, but the present passage, showing that there were to be different treasurers for the sacred and the secular treasures under the constitution of the Four Hundred, affords a very strong presumption that the same was the case ordinarily.

15. *πλείους προκρίνοντας*: that is, the Council was to nominate out of its own members a number of candidates for each office, greater than the number of offices to be filled (but how much greater we are not told), and from these the magistrates were to be finally elected.

17. *ἑλληνοταμίας*: it is presumably to this passage that Harpocration (*s. v.*) refers, when he says, *ὅτι ἀρχή τις ἦν οἱ ἑλληνοταμίαι, οἳ διεχείριζον τὰ χρήματα, καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης δηλοῖ ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ* (Rose, *Frag.* 362). There is no fuller description of them in the second part of the work, because the office did not exist in Aristotle's own day. It does not appear whether a distinction is intended to be drawn between those hellenotamiae who actually had the handling of the funds and the rest of the board; but as the duty of the whole board would naturally be described as *διαχειρίζειν τὰ χρήματα*, it is not clear in what the distinction would consist.

18. *βουλὰς δὲ ποιῆσαι τέτταρας κ.τ.λ.*: the arrangement of the *βουλαί* is not very clearly expressed, but it seems to be as follows. All persons

δὲ ποιῆσαι τέτταρας ἐκ τῆς ἡλικίας τῆς εἰρημένης
εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον, καὶ τούτων τὸ λαχὸν μέρος
βουλεύειν, νεῖμαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους πρὸς τὴν
λῆξιν ἑκάστην. τοὺς δ' ἑκατὸν ἄνδρας διανεῖμαι
σφᾶς τε αὐτοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τέτταρα μέρη ὡς
ἰσαίτατα καὶ διακληρῶσαι, καὶ εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν ⟨βου-
λεύειν⟩. βουλεύειν δὲ ᾗ ἂν δοκῇ αὐτοῖς ἄριστα 4
ἕξειν περί τε τῶν χρημάτων, ὅπως ἂν σῶα ᾖ καὶ εἰς
τὸ δέον ἀναλίσκηται, καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὡς ἂν
δύνωνται ἄριστα· κἄν τι θέλωσιν βουλεύσασθαι
μετὰ πλειόνων, ἐπεισκαλεῖν ἕκαστον ἐπείσκλητον ὃν
ἂν ἐθέλῃ τῶν ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ἡλικίας· τὰς δ' ἕδρας
ποιεῖν τῆς βουλῆς κατὰ πενθήμερον ἐὰν μὴ δέωνται
πλειόνων. κληροῦν δὲ τὴν βουλὴν τοὺς ἐννέα ἄρχον-
τας, τὰς δὲ χειροτονίας κρίνειν πέντε τοὺς λαχόντας
ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς, καὶ ἐκ τούτων ἕνα κληροῦσθαι καθ'

21. *βουλεύειν*: MS. *δουλευειν*. 24. *βουλεύειν*: not in MS., but the omission is easily intelligible; K-W. *βουλεύειν ⟨τοὺς λαχόντας. πράττειν⟩ δέ*, H-L. *βουλεύεσθαι* (after Richards), omitting *δέ*. 28. *κἄν*: MS. *εαν*. J. B. Mayor, K-W., H-L. *ἐὰν δέ*. 29. *ἐπείσκλητον*: MS. *επεισεκλητον*, corrected to *επεισεκκλητον*. 31. *πενθήμερον*: MS. *πενθημιμερον*.

(that is, presumably, all who belonged to the Five Thousand) over the age of thirty were to be divided into four groups, each acting in turn as the Council, with the addition of the *ex officio* members mentioned in l. 7 ff. The suggestion in the first edition that there were to be four councils, each of a hundred persons, carved out of the original Four Hundred, is shown to be erroneous by the fact that the candidates for the offices enumerated above were to be selected from the Council for the year; and as these officials amount to more than a hundred, the candidates can hardly have been less than twice that number.

29. *ἐπείσκλητον*: the word is unknown to the lexicographers, but so also is *ἐπεισκαλεῖν*.

31. *πενθήμερον*: the meaning must be 'once every five days.' The *βουλή* under the democracy sat every day except on festivals (*πλὴν ἐὰν τις ἀφέσιμος ᾖ*, ch. 43).

5 ἑκάστην ἡμέραν τὸν ἐπιψηφιοῦντα. κληροῦν δὲ τοὺς λαχόντας πέντε τοὺς ἐθέλοντας προσελθεῖν ἐναντίον τῆς βουλῆς, πρῶτον μὲν ἱερῶν, δεύτερον δὲ κήρυξιν, τρίτον πρεσβείαις, τέταρτον τῶν ἄλλων· τὰ δὲ τοῦ πολέμου ὅταν δέῃ ἀκληρωτὶ προσαγαγόντας
6 τοὺς στρατηγοὺς χρηματίζεσθαι. τὸν δὲ μὴ ἰόντα εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον τῶν βουλευόντων τὴν ὥραν τὴν προρρηθεῖσαν ὀφείλειν δραχμὴν τῆς ἡμέρας ἑκάστης, ἐὰν μὴ εὑρισκόμενος ἄφεσιν τῆς βουλῆς ἀπῇ.

31. Ταύτην μὲν οὖν εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα χρόνον [Col. 13.]
ἀνέγραψαν τὴν πολιτείαν, ἐν δὲ τῷ παρόντι καιρῷ

38. *πρεσβείαις*: MS. *πρεσβειαι*, which might stand as the dat. sing., but the plural is more natural, and *cf.* 43, l. 37. 42. *προρρηθεῖσαν*: MS. *προρηθεισαν*. *Cf.* note on *ἰσόρροπα*, 29, l. 1. 43. *εὑρισκόμενος*: H-L. *εὑρόμενος*, after Tyrrell and Richards.

37. *ἱερῶν . . κήρυξιν . . πρεσβείαις . . τῶν ἄλλων*: the change of case is remarkable, but it is evidently the official phrase, *cf.* ch. 43, ll. 36, 37, and Aesch. *in Timarch.* § 23, *προχειροτονεῖν κελεύει τοὺς προέδρους περὶ ἱερῶν τῶν πατρίων καὶ κήρυξι καὶ πρεσβείαις καὶ ὁσίων*. The order of business is probably that usually adopted in the *βουλή* under the democracy. In the ecclesia, as appears from ch. 43, l. 20 ff., different subjects were assigned to each of the four ordinary meetings of that body in each prytany.

XXXI. 1. *Ταύτην μὲν οὖν*: the handwriting of the MS. changes here, and the new hand continues as far as the middle of the 20th column. This hand is a much larger uncial than the first, and not semi-cursive, as that is (*vid.* Introduction); it is clearly the hand of a scribe, though a somewhat uneducated one. Mistakes, which have hitherto been rare, become not unfrequent, and several forms of mis-spelling are chronic. As it would be tedious to note each case as it occurs the chief classes of them may be mentioned here. The single letter *ι* often takes the place of the diphthong *ει*, especially in the preposition *εἰς*; *e.g.* *ισιοντα, πλιον, ιληχυιαν*. On the other hand *ει* appears for *ι*, as in *πολειτικων, μετακεινειν*. The *ι* ascript is often omitted, and *ν* appears instead of *γ* before *γ* and *κ*. These mis-spellings, as well as the actual mistakes which occur from time to time, are generally corrected in the hand of the writer of the first part of the MS.; and it seems probable, as suggested in the Introduction, that the first part was written by a

τήνδε· βουλεύειν μὲν τετρακοσίους κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, τετταράκοντα ἐξ ἑκάστης φυλῆς, ἐκ προκρίτων [ο]ὓς ἂν ἕλωνται οἱ φυλέται τῶν ὑπὲρ τριάκοντα ἔτη γεγονότων. τούτους δὲ τάς τε ἀρχὰς καταστῆσαι καὶ περὶ τοῦ ὅρκου ὅντινα χρὴ ὀμόσαι γράψαι, ⟨καὶ⟩ περὶ τῶν νόμων καὶ τῶν εὐθυ[ν]ῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πράττειν ᾗ ἂν ἡγῶνται [συμ]φέρειν. τοῖς δὲ νόμοις 2
οἳ ἂν τεθῶσιν περὶ τῶν πολιτικῶν χρῆσθαι, καὶ μὴ ἐξεῖναι μετακινεῖν μηδ᾽ ἑτέρους θέσθαι. τῶν δὲ στρατηγῶν τὸ νῦν εἶναι τὴν αἵρεσιν ἐξ ἁπάντων ποιεῖσθαι τῶν πεντακισχιλίων, τὴν δὲ βουλὴν ἐπειδὰν καταστῇ ποιήσασαν ἐξέτασιν ὅπλων ἑλέσθαι δέκα ἄνδρας καὶ γραμματέα τούτοις, τοὺς δὲ αἱρεθέντας ἄρχειν τὸν εἰσιόντα ἐνιαυτὸν αὐτο-

7. *καὶ περὶ τῶν νόμων*: MS. om. *και*, an error due probably to the similarity of the termination of *γράψαι*, which precedes it. 10. *ἄν*: MS. *εαν*. 14. *καταστῇ*: MS. *καταστησηι*. *ὅπλων*: MS. *οπλοις*, but the phrase with the genitive seems invariable. Otherwise ⟨*ἐν*⟩ *ὅπλοις* is an easier correction, Wyse, and so K-W., Blass, H-L. 16. *εἰσιόντα*: H-L. *ἐξιόντα*.

scholar who desired to possess a copy of Aristotle's work, while the second part was copied by a scribe under his revision. Finally it may be noticed that there are no abbreviations in this hand, and that the columns are much narrower. Blunders of the scribe which are corrected by the reviser are not mentioned in the notes, any more than the habitual mis-spellings above mentioned.

3. *κατὰ τὰ πατρια*: a phrase generally indicating the Solonian constitution; but *cf.* 34, l. 23 ff.

4. *οὓς ἂν ἕλωνται οἱ φυλέται*: this differs from Thucydides, who says (VIII. 67) that the Four Hundred were elected by a process of co-optation; five *πρόεδροι*, elected by the Ecclesia at Colonus, were to choose a hundred persons, who were each to nominate three others. The nearest approach to a reconciliation between the two accounts is to suppose that the method of selection among the candidates (*πρόκριτοι*) named by the tribes (which is not here specified) was one of co-optation by the original hundred commissioners; but the method of appointing the hundred (whether there were two such bodies or one, *cf.* note on 30, l. 2) cannot well be reconciled with Thucydides.

16. *εἰσιόντα*: the conjecture of H-L, *ἐξιόντα*, seems unnecessary. It

κράτορας, καὶ ἄν τι δέωνται συμβουλεύεσθαι μετὰ τῆς βουλῆς. ἑλέσθαι δὲ καὶ ἵππαρχον ἕνα καὶ
3 *φυλάρχους δέκα· τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν τὴν αἵρεσιν ποιεῖσθαι τούτων τὴν βουλὴν κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα. τῶν δ' ἄλλων ἀρχῶν πλὴν τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τῶν στρατηγῶν μὴ ἐξεῖναι μήτε τούτοις μήτε ἄλλῳ μηδενὶ πλέον ἢ ἅπαξ ἄρξαι τὴν αὐτὴν ἀρχήν. εἰς δὲ τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον, ἵνα νεμηθῶσιν οἱ τετρακόσιοι εἰς τὰς τέτταρας λήξεις, ὅταν † τοῖς ἀστοῖς † γίγνηται μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων βουλεύειν διανειμάντων αὐτοὺς οἱ ἑκατὸν ἄνδρες.*

32. *Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἑκατὸν οἱ ὑπὸ τῶν πεντακισχι-*

19. *τὸ δὲ λοιπόν*: MS. *το δε το λοιπον.* 21. *πλήν*: MS. *πριν.* *Cf.* 37, l. 18; 39, l. 10. 22. *πλέον*: MS. *πλειον*, *cf.* Meisterhans, p. 120. 25. *ἀστοῖς*: H-L. *α[ὐ]τοῖς*, after Tyrrell. 27. *ἄνδρες*: MS. *ανδδρεις.*

was now less than two months to the close of the year, and that period would be occupied by the generals chosen *ἐξ ἁπάντων τῶν πεντακισχιλίων*. During that time the *βουλή* would be constituted and the review of arms made, and the generals thereon appointed would enter office with the new year.

18. *ἵππαρχον ἕνα*: ordinarily there were two hipparchs (*cf.* ch. 61, l. 23).

23. *εἰς δὲ τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον κ.τ.λ.*: this sentence is certainly obscure and possibly corrupt. The difficulty lies in the clause *ὅταν . . . βουλεύειν*. K-W. explain *τῶν ἄλλων* as *τῶν ἐν Σάμῳ*, but *βουλεύειν* is a technical word, and the Athenians with the fleet would not become members of the *βουλή* on their return, and there would be no occasion to await their return before arranging the subdivision of the Four Hundred among the four councils. The process spoken of is probably the same as that described in ch. 30, ll. 22–24, *τοὺς δ' ἑκατὸν ἄνδρας διανεῖμαι σφᾶς τε αὐτοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τέτταρα μέρη κ.τ.λ.*, and *τῶν ἄλλων* here are then the same as *τοὺς ἄλλους* there, viz. the remainder of the persons over thirty years of age out of whom the Councils were to be formed. *τοῖς ἀστοῖς* must therefore represent the Four Hundred, and (if the words be not entirely expunged as a mistaken addition by a gloss-writer) should perhaps be altered to *αὐτοῖς*, 'when the time comes for them to join in council with the rest.' But this explanation cannot be called certain.

λίων αἱρεθέντες ταύτην ἀνέγραψαν τὴν πολιτείαν. ἐπικυρωθέντων δὲ τούτων ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους, ἐπιψηφίσαντος Ἀριστομάχου, ἡ μὲν βουλὴ ⟨ἡ⟩ ἐπὶ Καλλίου πρὶν διαβουλεῦσαι κατελύθη μηνὸς Θαργηλιῶνος τετράδι ἐπὶ δέκα, οἱ δὲ τετρακόσιοι εἰσῆσαν ἐνάτῃ φθίνοντος Θαργηλιῶνος· ἔδει δὲ τὴν εἰληχυῖαν τῷ κυάμῳ βουλὴν εἰσιέναι δ̄ ἐπὶ δέκα Σκιροφοριῶνος.

ἡ μὲν οὖν ὀλιγαρχία τοῦτον κατέστη τὸν τρόπον 2
ἐπὶ Καλλίου μὲν ἄρχοντος, ἔτεσιν δʼ ὕστερον τῆς τῶν τυράννων ἐκβολῆς μάλιστα ἑκατόν, αἰτίων μάλιστα γενομένων Πεισάνδρου καὶ Ἀντιφῶντος καὶ Θηραμένους, ἀνδρῶν καὶ γεγενημένων εὖ καὶ
[Col. 14.] *συνέσει καὶ γνώμῃ δοκούντων διαφέρειν. γενομένης* 3
δὲ ταύτης τῆς πολιτείας οἱ μὲν πεντακισχίλιοι λόγῳ μόνον ᾑρέθησαν, οἱ δὲ τετρακόσιοι μετὰ τῶν δέκα

XXXII. 4. *ἡ ἐπὶ Καλλίου*: *ἡ* is added by Rutherford, Blass, H-L., K-W. 6. *εἰσῆσαν*: MS. *εισηιεσαν*. 7. *ἔδει*: MS. *ετι*. 11. *μάλιστα*: H-L. om., as a false repetition from the next line; but the omission converts a true statement into a false one. 12. *Πεισάνδρου*: MS. *πετισανδρου*, with an *ε* added above the *ετ*. 16. *ᾑρέθησαν*: written twice in MS., but the repetition is cancelled by a row of dots above it. In the first instance it has been wrongly corrected, in the scribe's own hand, to *ερηθησαν*. *οἱ*: MS. *ο*.

XXXII. 5. *μηνὸς Θαργηλιῶνος τετράδι ἐπὶ δέκα*: this, as appears from what follows, was exactly a month before the completion of the Council's year of office, Thargelion (May) being the month immediately preceding Scirophorion (June), which was the last of the Athenian civil year. Callias' year of office began in July 412 B.C., and was now within a month of its termination.

12. *Πεισάνδρου κ.τ.λ.*: the enumeration of these three leaders is parallel with that in Thucydides (VIII. 68), but the latter names Phrynichus instead of Theramenes; and to judge from the general character of Theramenes it is probable that he was not so much an originator of this revolution as one of the first to recognise that it was impending and to adapt himself to it so as to secure for himself a prominent position under the new régime.

16. *τῶν δέκα τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων*: the generals mentioned in the preceding chapter.

τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον ἦρχον τῆς πόλεως, καὶ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους πρεσβευσάμενοι κατελύοντο τὸν πόλεμον ἐφ' οἷς ἑκάτεροι τυγχάνουσιν ἔχοντες. οὐχ ὑπακου[σά]ντων δ' ἐκείνων εἰ μὴ καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς [θ]αλάττης ἀφήσουσιν, οὕτως ἀπέστησαν.

33. Μῆνας μὲν οὖν ἴσως τέτταρας διέμεινεν ἡ τῶν τετρακοσίων πολιτεία, καὶ ἦρξεν ἐξ αὐτῶν Μνασίλοχος δίμηνον ἐπὶ Θεοπόμπου ἄρχοντος, ⟨ὃς⟩ ἦρξε τοὺς ἐπιλοίπους δέκα μῆνας. ἡττηθέντες δὲ τῇ περὶ Ἐρέτριαν ναυμαχίᾳ κ[αὶ] τῆς Εὐβοίας ἀποστάσης ὅλης πλὴν Ὠρεοῦ, χαλεπῶς ἐνεγκόντες ἐπὶ τῇ συμφορᾷ μάλιστα τῶν προγεγενημένων (πλείω γὰρ ἐκ τῆς Εὐβοίας ἢ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἐτύγχανον ὠφελούμενοι) κατέλυσαν τοὺς τετρακοσίους καὶ τὰ πράγματα παρέδωκαν τοῖς πεντακισχιλίοις τοῖς ἐκ τῶν ὅπλων, ψηφισάμενοι μηδεμίαν ἀρχὴν εἶναι

18. ἦρχον: K-W. ἦρχόν τε, after Hude. 20. τυγχάνουσιν: the first three letters end a line in the MS., and at the beginning of the next two superfluous letters, apparently λε or τε, have been inserted before the χ. ὑπακουσάντων: H-L. ὑπακου[ό]ντων, thinking that the lacuna will only hold one letter, which is doubtful. XXXIII. 3. Μνασίλοχος: MS. at first μνασιμαχος, but corrected. K-W. Μνησίλοχος. 4. ὃς: not in MS., but the omission is easily explained by the similarity of the termination of ἄρχοντος which precedes. H-L. ὁ δ'. 6. Ὠρεοῦ: MS. ωριου.

XXXIII. 1. Μῆνας ... τέτταρας: the Four Hundred came into power rather less than two months before the end of the archonship of Callias, and their rule consequently extended over rather more than two months of the following year (May–Sept. 411 B.C.). Mnasilochus was the archon eponymus of their election; but Theopompus being elected on the re-establishment of the democracy the year was subsequently known by his name. Harpocration (*s. v.* τετρακόσιοι) refers to Aristotle's Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία as his authority for the duration of the rule of the Four Hundred (Rose, *Frag.* 372).

3. Μνασίλοχος: Mnasilochus or Mnesilochus is probably the same as the person of that name who was subsequently a member of the Thirty (Xen. *Hell.* II. 3. 2).

μισθοφόρον. αἰτιώτατοι δ' ἐγένοντο τῆς κατα- 2
λύσεως Ἀριστοκράτης καὶ Θηραμένης, οὐ συναρεσκόμενοι τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν τετρακοσίων γιγνομένοις· ἅπαντα γὰρ δι' αὐτῶν ἔπραττον, οὐδὲν ἐπαναφέροντες τοῖς πεντακισχιλίοις. δοκοῦσι δὲ καλῶς πολιτευθῆναι κατὰ τούτους τοὺς καιρούς, πολέμου τε καθεστῶτος καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὅπλων τῆς πολιτείας οὔσης.

34. Τούτους μὲν οὖν ἀφείλετο τὴν πολιτείαν ὁ δῆμος διὰ τάχους· ἔτει δ' ἑβδόμῳ μετὰ τὴν τῶν τετρακοσίων κατάλυσιν, ἐπὶ Καλλίου τοῦ Ἀγγελῆθεν ἄρχοντος, γενομένης τῆς ἐν Ἀργινούσαις ναυμαχίας, πρῶτον μὲν τοὺς δέκα στρατηγοὺς τοὺς

12. *μισθοφόρον*: so J. B. Mayor, Rutherford, Fraenkel, H-L., K-W.; MS. *μισθοφορων*. 14. *γιγνομένοις*: MS. *γενομενοις*, corr. to *γιν-*. XXXIV. 3. *κατάλυσιν*: K-W. *κατάστασιν*, but K-W.[2] restore *κατάλυσιν*, and substitute *ἕκτῳ* for *ἑβδόμῳ* in l. 2.

13. *Ἀριστοκράτης καὶ Θηραμένης*: *cf.* Thuc. VIII. 89.

16. *δοκοῦσι δὲ καλῶς πολιτευθῆναι κατὰ τούτους τοὺς καιρούς*: this must undoubtedly be an intentional repetition of the comment of Thucydides (VIII. 97) in which the same judgment is expressed at greater length.

XXXIV. 2. *διὰ τάχους*: as has been suggested in the Introduction, the abolition of the government by the nominal Five Thousand and the re-establishment of the full democracy probably took place after the victory of Cyzicus in 410 B.C., which both restored the confidence of the people and allowed the fleet, the embodiment of the most advanced democratic sentiments of the time, to return to Athens.

ἔτει δ' ἑβδόμῳ: this must be a mistake. The archonship of Theopompus, in which the Four Hundred were overthrown, was in 411–410 B.C., and the archonship of Callias in 406–405 B.C. The latter was therefore in the sixth year after the dissolution of the Four Hundred, not the seventh. The calculation was probably made by inadvertence from the *establishment* of the Four Hundred, which was in the official year 412–411 B.C. K-W. alter *κατάλυσιν* to *κατάστασιν*, but the custom of this treatise is to reckon a date from the last fixed point, not from an earlier one; and it seems more probable that a mistake was made in the number.

5. *τοὺς δέκα στρατηγούς*: Aristotle certainly appears to be inaccurate here. Two of the ten generals, Conon and Leon, were not included in the accusation, the former having been blockaded in Mytilene during

τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ νικῶντας συνέβη κριθῆναι μιᾷ χειροτονίᾳ πάντας, τοὺς μὲν οὐδὲ συνναυμαχήσαντας, τοὺς δ' ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίας νεὼς σωθέντας, ἐξαπατηθέντος τοῦ δήμου διὰ τοὺς παροργίσαντας· ἔπειτα βουλομένων Λακεδαιμονίων ἐκ Δεκελείας ἀπιέναι καὶ ἐφ' οἷς ἔχουσιν ἑκάτεροι εἰρήνην ἄγειν, ἔνιοι μὲν ἐσπούδαζον, τὸ δὲ πλῆθος οὐχ ὑπήκουσεν ἐξαπατηθέντες [Col. 15.] ὑπὸ Κλεοφῶντος, ὃς ἐκώλυσε γενέσθαι τὴν εἰρήνην

XXXIV. 8. ἐξαπατηθέντος: MS. εξαπατηθεντες. 10. ἀπιέναι: so Blass, K-W., H-L., *etc.*; MS. ανιεναι, but the scholiast on Aristophanes who quotes the passage (see note on l. 13) gives ἀπιέναι, which is also the more probable word. καί: K-W. transpose after ἑκάτεροι, in accordance with the scholiast, but the MS. order is more natural. 11. ἑκάτεροι εἰρήνην: MS. ιρηνην εκατεροι, an inversion which is more likely to be due to the scribe than the author. Gomperz εἰρήνην ἄγειν ἑκάτεροι. 12. ἐξαπατηθέντες: Rutherford ἐξαπατηθέν.

the battle, while of the latter we hear nothing in connection with either the battle or the trial. Of the remaining eight, two, Protomachus and Aristogenes, declined to come to Athens to stand their trial; and consequently only six of the whole ten were tried and executed. Professor Gomperz, however, points out that the same phrase is used by Plato, only some ten years after the event (*Apol.* 32 B), ὅτε ὑμεῖς τοὺς δέκα στρατηγοὺς . . . ἐβούλεσθε ἀθρόως κρίνειν, and possibly there was something in the form of the indictment which justifies the phrase. *Cf.* also [Plat.] *Axioch.* 368 D (as quoted by Stobaeus, 98, 75), ποῦ δὲ (τεθνήκασι) πρῴην οἱ δέκα στρατηγοί, and Aelian *V. H.* III. 17, οὐκ ἐπεψήφισεν Ἀθηναίοις (Σωκράτης) τὸν τῶν δέκα στρατηγῶν θάνατον.

6. χειροτονίᾳ: the decision to try all the generals collectively was taken by χειροτονία, but the actual vote which condemned them was by ballot (Xen. *Hell.* I. 7. 34).

7. τοὺς μὲν οὐδὲ συνναυμαχήσαντας: it is difficult to understand this, as Xenophon expressly names eight of the generals (all except Conon and Leon) as having been present at the battle, and indicates their respective positions in the Athenian line. Unless Leon was included in the accusation, of which there is no sign in any other authority (except the passages quoted in the note on l. 5), the statement of Aristotle seems to be an unwarranted exaggeration due to his evident dislike (or that of the authorities on whom he relied) of the proceedings in reference to the generals. His other statement, that some of the generals themselves had to be saved, instead of being in a position to save others, is possible enough.

13. ὑπὸ Κλεοφῶντος: this passage is cited by the scholiast on Aristophanes (*Frogs*, 1532), ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης φησί, μετὰ τὴν ἐν Ἀργινούσαις ναυμα-

ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μεθύων καὶ θώρακα ἐνδε-
δυκώς, οὐ φάσκων ἐπιτρέψειν ἐὰν μὴ πάσας ἀφιῶσι
Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὰς πόλεις. οὐ χρησάμενοι δὲ 2
καλῶς τότε τοῖς πράγμα[σι], μετ' οὐ πολὺν χρόνον
ἔγνωσαν τὴν ἁμαρ[τίαν]. τῷ γὰρ ὕστερον ἔτει
ἐπ' Ἀλεξίου ἄρχοντος ἠτύχησαν τὴν ἐν Αἰγὸς
ποταμοῖς ναυμαχίαν, ἐξ ἧς συνέβη κύριον γενόμενον
τῆς πόλεως Λύσανδρον καταστῆσαι τοὺς τριάκοντα
τρόπῳ τοιῷδε. τῆς εἰρήνης γενομένης αὐτοῖς ἐφ' 3
ᾧ τε πολιτεύσονται τὴν πάτριον πολιτείαν, οἱ μὲν
δημοτικοὶ διασῴζειν ἐπειρῶντο τὸν δῆμον, τῶν δὲ

15. ἀφιῶσι: K-W., H-L. ἀφῶσι, from the scholiast. 24. διασῴζειν: MS. διασωζειν, corrected to διασωσειν (and so 1st ed.); the correction may perhaps stand, πειρᾶσθαι being treated as if it were a verb of hoping; but it is hardly probable. J. B. Mayor and Wyse διασῶσαι (introducing a hiatus), Blass, H-L., K-W., διασῴζειν.

χίαν Λακεδαιμονίων βουλομένων ἐκ Δεκελείας ἀπιέναι ἐφ' οἷς ἔχουσιν ἑκάτεροι καὶ εἰρήνην ἄγειν, ἐπὶ τοῦ Καλλίου, Κλεοφῶν ἔπεισε τὸν δῆμον μὴ προσδέξασθαι ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μεθύων καὶ θώρακα ἐνδεδυκώς, οὐ φάσκων ἐπιτρέψειν ἐὰν μὴ πάσας ἀφῶσι τὰς πόλεις οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι (Rose, *Frag.* 370). Grote doubts the truth of this application for peace by the Lacedaemonians, believing the story to be a confusion with the proposals which Diodorus states to have been made after the battle of Cyzicus. But it is by no means improbable that the Lacedaemonians should have been willing to propose a peace after so severe a defeat as Arginusae,—a defeat irreparable except through the help of Persia, which they did not at the time possess; especially as peace on the terms proposed would leave Athens stripped of nearly the whole of her maritime empire. Neither Xenophon nor Diodorus mentions any negotiations at this time; but Xenophon does not mention any after Cyzicus either. Grote suspected the scholiast to have mis-quoted Aristotle, but the case is altered by the discovery of the complete text of the latter; and if there is any confusion as to the real date of the Lacedaemonian proposals, it is more likely to be on the part of Diodorus than of Aristotle.

19. *ἐπ' Ἀλεξίου ἄρχοντος*: 405–404 B.C.

23. *τὴν πάτριον πολιτείαν*: this was a sufficiently vague term, indicating generally the constitution of Solon; but as the virtue of the constitution depended on its working, it was possible for moderate democrats, extreme oligarchs, and moderate aristocrats alike to hope

γνωρίμων οἱ μὲν ἐν ταῖς ἑταιρείαις ὄντες καὶ τῶν φυγάδων οἱ μετὰ τὴν εἰρήνην κατελθόντες ὀλιγαρχίας ἐπεθύμουν, οἱ δ' ἐν ἑταιρείᾳ μὲν οὐδεμιᾷ συγκαθεστῶτες [ἄ]λλως δὲ δοκοῦντες οὐδενὸς ἐπιλείπεσθαι τῶν πολιτῶν τὴν πάτριον πολιτείαν ἐζήτουν· ὧν ἦν μὲν καὶ Ἀρχῖνος καὶ Ἄνυτος καὶ Κλειτοφῶν καὶ Φορμίσιος καὶ ἕτεροι πολλοί, προειστήκει δὲ μάλιστα Θηραμένης. Λυσάνδρου δὲ προσθεμένου τοῖς ὀλιγαρχικοῖς καταπλαγεὶς ὁ δῆμος ἠναγκάσθη χειροτονεῖν τὴν ὀλιγαρχίαν. ἔγραψε δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα Δρακοντίδης Ἀφιδναῖος.

35. *Οἱ μὲν οὖν τριάκοντα τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον κατέστησαν ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρου ἄρχοντος. γενόμενοι δὲ κύριοι τῆς πόλεως τὰ μὲν ἄλλα τὰ δόξαντα περὶ τῆς πολιτείας παρεώρων, πεντακοσίους δὲ βουλευτὰς καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀρχὰς καταστήσαντες ἐκ προκρίτων*

26. *ὀλιγαρχίας*: MS. *ολιγαρχιαν*. 28. *ἐπιλείπεσθαι*: possibly by iotacism for *ἐπιλιπέσθαι*. H-L. *ἀπολείπεσθαι*, after Richards, Gennadios, Hultsch, Kontos; *cf.* 20, l. 6. 29. *ἐζήτουν*: so MS., not *ἐζήλουν*, as H-L. read doubtfully. 30. *Ἄνυτος*: MS. *αννυτος*. *Κλειτοφῶν*: MS. *κλιτοφων*. XXXV. 2. *κατέστησαν*: MS. *κατεστησε*.

that it would be modelled according to their views. Diodorus (XIV. 3) describes the arguments of the opposing parties at some length, and says that the point was decided by Lysander declaring for an oligarchy.

30. Ἀρχῖνος: subsequently one of the exiles who joined Thrasybulus in his occupation of Phyle (Demosth. *contr. Timocr.* p. 742); *cf.* ch. 40. Anytus was another of the same number (Xen. *Hell.* II. 3. 44). Cleitophon may be the same as the person of that name mentioned in connection with the establishment of the Four Hundred.

35. Δρακοντίδης: Dracontides is mentioned by Aristophanes (*Wasps*, 157), where the scholiast refers to the present passage of Aristotle (Rose, *Frag.* 373). He was himself one of the Thirty (Xen. *Hell.* II. 3. 2).

XXXV. 2. ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρου ἄρχοντος: the year 404–403 B.C.; but the name of Pythodorus was subsequently expunged from the records, and the year was known as the year of Anarchy.

ἐκ τῶν χιλίων, καὶ προσελόμενοι σφίσιν αὐτοῖς τοῦ Πειραιέως ἄρχοντας δέκα καὶ τοῦ δεσμωτηρίου φύλακας ἕνδεκα καὶ μαστιγοφόρους τρια[κ]οσίους ὑπηρέτας κατεῖχον τὴν πόλιν δι' ἑαυτῶν. τὸ μὲν 2
οὖν πρῶτον μέτριοι τοῖς πολίταις [ἦ]σα[ν] καὶ προσεποιοῦντο διοικεῖν τὴν πάτριον πο[λιτ]είαν, καὶ τούς τ' Ἐφιάλτου καὶ Ἀρχεστράτου νόμους τοὺς περὶ τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν καθεῖλον ἐξ Ἀρείου [πάγου] καὶ τῶν Σόλωνος θεσμῶν ὅσοι διαμφισβητ[ήσ]εις εἶχον, καὶ τὸ κῦρος ὃ ἦν ἐν τοῖς δικασταῖς κ[ατέ]λυσαν, ὡς ἐπανορθοῦντες καὶ ποιοῦντ[ες] ἀναμ-
[Col. 16.] *φισβήτητον τὴν πολιτείαν, οἷο[ν] περὶ τοῦ δοῦναι*

6. *ἐκ τῶν χιλίων*: K-W. suggest *πεντακισχιλίων*, H-L. read *ἐκ τῶν πεντακισχιλίων*. 9. *ἑαυτῶν*: H-L. *αὐτῶν* after J. B. Mayor. 11. *διοικεῖν*: K-W., H-L., Kontos, Gertz *διώκειν*, comparing 13, l. 22; but *διοικεῖν* is suitable in sense here, and *cf.* 27, l. 14. 14. *διαμφισβητήσεις*: MS. *διαμφιζβητησεις*. So again, l. 16, MS. *αναμφιζβητητον*. Meisterhans (pp. 68, 70) notes this interchange of ζ and σ as occurring in inscriptions after 329 B.C.; *e.g.* *ψήφιζμα*, C. I. A. II. 468, 16. 17. After *οἷον* K-W. insert *τόν*.

6. *ἐκ τῶν χιλίων*: there is no other mention of a body of 1000, and it is possible that the phrase is merely epexegetic of *ἐκ προκρίτων*, indicating that a list of 1000 persons was at first drawn up from which the 500 members of the council were finally selected. Mr. Newman (*Class. Rev.* V. 164) suggests that it may mean the Knights, quoting Aristoph. *Knights* 225, *ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ἱππῆς ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ χίλιοι*, and Philochorus, frag. 100 (Hesych. *s. v.* *ἱππῆς*). But it cannot mean that the *πρόκριτοι* were selected from a body of 1000 persons, since the *πρόκριτοι* from whom a Council of 500 was to be chosen would hardly be themselves less than 1000 in number. H-L. read *ἐκ τῶν πεντακισχιλίων*, but we know of no body of 5000 existing at this time, unless it was again taken as meaning all persons capable of furnishing arms.

12. *καὶ Ἀρχεστράτου*: there appears to be no mention elsewhere of these laws affecting the Areopagus, but probably Archestratus was one of the supporters of Ephialtes and some of the laws curtailing the power of the Areopagus stood in his name.

15. *τὸ κῦρος ὃ ἦν ἐν τοῖς δικασταῖς*: this has been mentioned above (ch. 9, l. 6 ff.) as the foundation of the whole power of the democracy, and it is therefore natural that it should be one of the first things abolished by the oligarchy.

17. *περὶ τοῦ δοῦναι τὰ ἑαυτοῦ κ.τ.λ.*: the law of Solon relative to testa-

τὰ ἑαυτοῦ ᾧ ἂν ἐθέλῃ κύριον ποιήσαντες καθάπαξ, τὰς δὲ προσούσας δυσκολίας, ἐὰν μὴ μανιῶν ἢ γηρῶν ἢ γυναικὶ πιθόμενος, ἀφεῖλον ὅπως μὴ ᾖ τοῖς συκοφάνταις ἔφοδος· ὁμοίως δὲ τοῦτ' ἔδρων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων.
3 κατ' ἀρχὰς μὲν οὖν ταῦτ' ἐποίουν καὶ τοὺς συκοφάντας καὶ τοὺς τῷ δήμῳ πρὸς χάριν ὁμιλοῦντας παρὰ τὸ βέλτιστον καὶ κακοπράγμονας

18. After ἂν H-L. insert τις. ποιήσαντες: K-W. ἐποίησαν. The sentence does not appear to require alteration. 19. ἐὰν μὴ κ.τ.λ.: in [Dem.] *contr. Steph.* II. § 14, p. 1133, these provisions are given as ἂν μὴ μανιῶν ἢ γήρως ἢ φαρμάκων ἢ νόσου ἕνεκα, ἢ γυναικὶ πειθόμενος. Accordingly Blass and Wyse have proposed to read γήρως ⟨ἕνεκα⟩ here, and H-L., Poland and others would even add ἢ φαρμάκων ἢ νόσου. This is hardly a justifiable way to treat a text, and Mr. Robinson Ellis's suggestion that ᾖ has fallen out is much simpler and more probable; but the quotation in Demosthenes suggests that a verb may not be necessary. If it be restored it should follow μανιῶν or γηρῶν. 20. πιθόμενος: Wyse and Poland πειθόμενος, from [Dem.] *l. c.* 24. καί is bracketed by K-W.

mentary dispositions made it lawful for a man who had no legitimate children to dispose of his property in whatever way he chose, provided that he was of sound mind at the time and was not subject to undue influence. It is mentioned by Plutarch (*Sol.* 21) and quoted in [Dem.] *contr. Steph.* II. § 14, p. 1133, and is repeatedly referred to by the orators (*e.g.* Dem. *in Lept.* § 102, p. 488, *contr. Olymp.* § 56, p. 1183; Isaeus *de Menecl. hered.*, *passim*, *de Philoct. hered.* § 10, p. 57). The change introduced by the oligarchs simply consisted in abolishing the provisions against mental incapacity and undue influence, which, though reasonable enough in themselves, had been abused and had given rise to much συκοφαντία. An instance of this may be found in the case of the will of Menecles on which Isaeus composed the speech mentioned above. It is clear that this is the meaning of the sentence, and not that the oligarchs removed all restrictions on testamentary dispositions *except* those relating to mental incapacity and undue influence, partly because Aristotle could not speak of so revolutionary a change in the law of property as merely an amendment to remove certain difficulties or obscurities, and partly because it does not appear how such an alteration would have limited the opportunities of the συκοφάντης. The law which required a man who had legitimate children to leave the bulk of his property among them remained intact; and it is clear from the allusions in the orators that even the amendment which the oligarchs actually introduced was repealed when the democracy was re-established.

ὄντας καὶ πονηροὺς ἀνῄρουν, ἐφ' οἷς ἔχαιρον ἡ πόλις γιγνομένοις, ἡγούμενοι τοῦ βελτίστου χάριν ποιεῖν αὐτούς. ἐπεὶ δὲ τὴν πόλιν ἐγκρατέστερον ἔσχον, 4 *οὐδενὸς ἀπείχοντο τῶν πολιτῶν, ἀλλ' ἀπέκτειναν τοὺς καὶ ταῖς οὐσίαις καὶ τῷ γένει καὶ τοῖς ἀξιώμασιν προέχοντας, ὑπεξαιρούμενοί τε τὸν φόβον καὶ βουλόμενοι τὰς οὐσίας διαρπάζειν· καὶ χρόνου διαπεσόντος βραχέος οὐκ ἐλάττους ἀνῃρήκεσαν ἢ χιλίους πεντακοσίους.*

36. *Οὕτως δὲ τῆς πόλεως ὑποφερομένης Θηραμένης ἀγανακτῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς γιγνομένοις τῆς μὲν ἀσελγείας αὐτοῖς παρῄνει παύσασθαι, μεταδοῦναι δὲ τῶν πραγμάτων τοῖς βελτίστοις. οἱ δὲ πρῶτον ἐναντιωθέντες, ἐπεὶ διεσπάρησαν οἱ λόγοι πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος καὶ πρὸς τὸν Θηραμένην οἰκείως εἶχον οἱ πολλοί, φοβηθέντες μὴ προστάτης γενόμενος τοῦ δήμου καταλύσῃ τὴν δυναστείαν καταλέγουσιν τῶν πολιτῶν τρισχιλίους ὡς μεταδώσοντες τῆς πολιτείας. Θηραμένης δὲ πάλιν ἐπιτιμᾷ καὶ τούτοις, πρῶτον* 2

25. *ἔχαιρον* : Sidgwick, Rutherford, K-W. correct to *ἔχαιρεν*, but the plural participle *ἡγούμενοι* seems to confirm the plural verb. Possibly *ἡ πόλις* is an adscript, but the theory of adscripts is dangerous, especially in the case of so early a MS. as this. 28. *ἀπέκτειναν* : Blass, Kontos, H-L., K-W. *ἀπέκτεινον*. XXXVI. 2. *γιγνομένοις* : MS. *γιν-*. 4. *πρῶτον* : MS. *πρωτοι*. 9. *τρισχιλίους* : MS. *δισχιλιους*, which must be a mere clerical blunder, as the writer goes on at once to speak of the number as 3000, without comment.

30. *ὑπεξαιρούμενοί τε τὸν φόβον* : *i. e.* removing their own apprehensions, by destroying those whom they had most reason to fear.

33. *χιλίους πεντακοσίους* : *cf.* Isocr. *Areop.* § 67 (cited by Mr. Newman), *πεντακοσίους μὲν καὶ χιλίους τῶν πολιτῶν ἀκρίτους ἀπέκτειναν.*

XXXVI. 10. *πρῶτον μὲν κ.τ.λ.* : *cf.* Xen. *Hell.* II. 3. 19, which contains the substance of the same criticisms and almost the same words. The latter part is indeed an almost verbal quotation from Theramenes, whose words are given by Xenophon, *ὁρῶ ἔγωγε δύο ἡμᾶς τὰ ἐναντιώτατα πράττοντας, βιαίαν τε τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ ἥττονα τῶν ἀρχομένων κατασκευαζομένους.*

μὲν ὅτι βουλόμενοι μεταδοῦναι τοῖς ἐπιεικέσι τρισχιλίοις μόνοις μεταδιδόασι, ὡς ἐν τούτῳ τῷ πλήθει τῆς ἀρετῆς ὡρισμένης, ἔπειθ' ὅτι δύο τὰ ἐναντιώτατα ποιοῦσιν, βίαιόν τε τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τῶν ἀρχομένων ἥττω κατασκευάζοντες. οἱ δὲ τούτων μὲν ὠλιγώρησαν, τὸν δὲ κατάλογον τῶν τρισχιλίων πολὺν μὲν χρόνον ὑπερεβάλλοντο καὶ παρ' αὑτοῖς ἐφύλαττον τοὺς ἐγνωσμένους, ὅτε δὲ καὶ δόξειεν αὐτοῖς ἐκφέρειν τοὺς μὲν ἐξήλειφον τῶν γεγραμμένων, τοὺς δ' ἀντενέγραφον τῶν ἔξωθεν.

37. Ἤδη δὲ τοῦ χειμῶνος ἐνεστῶτος, καταλαβόντος Θρασυβούλου μετὰ τῶν φυγάδων Φυλήν, καὶ κατὰ τὴν στρατιὰν ἣν ἐξήγαγον οἱ τριάκοντα κακῶς ἀποχωρήσαντες, ἔγνωσαν τῶν μὲν ἄλλων τὰ

15. κατασκευάζοντες: MS. at first μετασκευαζοντες, but corrected, and the correction is confirmed by the quotation from Xenophon in the note below on l. 10. 17. ὑπερεβάλλοντο: MS. υπερβαλλοντο. 19. γεγραμμένων: K-W., H-L. ἐγγεγραμμένων. XXXVII. 3. καί is bracketed by K-W. στρατιάν: K-W. στρατείαν, against MS. and without comment. οἱ τριάκοντα: H-L. del., after Richards.

XXXVII. 4. ἔγνωσαν κ.τ.λ.: this somewhat alters the order of events as we gather it from Xenophon. The latter first narrates the disarming of the people and the execution of Theramenes, and then says that after this (ἐκ δὲ τούτου, II. 4. 2) Thrasybulus made his descent on Phyle. According to Aristotle the disarmament and the execution of Theramenes were in consequence of the advance and first success of Thrasybulus. There is time in the chronology of the period for either order of events; the only difference is that we must allow a longer time for the stay of Thrasybulus at Phyle than is usually given in the histories. In this there is, however, no difficulty, especially as we know that the forces of the exiles grew from seventy to 1000 before they began their march from Phyle to Athens. They probably remained for two or three of the winter months at Phyle and then advanced. The date of the occupation of Munychia can be fixed within narrow limits from the speech of Cleocritus the herald after the fight in which Critias was killed (Xen. *Hell.* II. 4. 21), where he says that the Thirty had killed in eight months almost more than the Peloponnesians in ten years. Athens surrendered on the 16th of Munychion (April), and

ὅπλα παρελέσθαι, Θηραμένην δὲ διαφθεῖραι τόνδε
⟨τὸν⟩ τρόπον. νόμους εἰσήνεγκαν εἰς τὴν βουλὴν δύο
[Col. 17.] κελεύοντες ἐπιχειροτονεῖν, ὧν ὁ μὲν εἰς αὐτοκράτορας
ἐποίει τοὺς τριάκοντα τῶν πολιτῶν ἀποκτεῖναι τοὺς
μὴ τοῦ καταλόγου μετέχοντας τῶν τρισχιλίων, ὁ δ'
ἕτερος ἐκώλυε κοινωνεῖν τῆς παρούσης πολιτείας
ὅσοι τυγχάνουσιν τὸ ἐν Ἠετιωνείᾳ τεῖχος κατα-
σκάψαντες ἢ τοῖς τετρακοσίοις ἐναντίον τι πράξαντες
ἢ τοῖς κατασκευάσασι τὴν προτέραν ὀλιγαρχίαν· ὧ[ν]
ἐτύγχανεν ἀμφοτέρων κεκοινωνηκὼς ὁ Θηραμένης,
ὥστε συνέβαινεν ἐπικυρωθέντων τῶν νόμων ἔξω τε
γίγνεσθαι τῆς πολιτείας αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς τριάκοντα
κυρίους εἶναι θανατοῦντας. ἀναιρεθέντος δὲ Θηρα- 2

5. παρελέσθαι: MS. παριεσθαι; an ε has been written in correction above the first ι, but the λ is omitted. 6. τόν: *cf.* 7, l. 10. 13. ἤ: K-W. bracket, H-L. remove this word. 17. θανατοῦντας: H-L. θανατοῦν, after Lacon, Keil, and Poland; Kontos justifies the participle from Thuc. V. 34, Plat. *Laws* p. 878 E, Polyb. III. 85, 2 *et alibi*, and inscriptions.

the Thirty were probably established about the beginning of the following month. Eight full months would bring us to Gamelion (January), about which point we may place the defeat of the Thirty at Munychia by Thrasybulus. The government of the Ten, which followed, and the intervention of the Spartans occupied several months more, and the democracy was restored about the following August, after sixteen months intermission.

6. **νόμους εἰσήνεγκαν κ.τ.λ.**: as to the first of these two laws Aristotle agrees with Xenophon (*Hell.* II. 3. 51), but as to the second the two accounts differ fundamentally. If Aristotle is right as to the passing of the second law, the well-known dramatic scene depicted by Xenophon must disappear. At best it can only be supposed that Critias, instead of striking out the name of Theramenes from the list of the 3000, proposed the second law as described by Aristotle and forced it down the throat of the council by threat of armed force. This is possible, as the law is in itself so obviously aimed at Theramenes that it is difficult to suppose that he would have remained in Athens after seeing that it was likely to be passed; but if it is the case the narrative of Xenophon will require so many alterations in detail as to show that it is largely imaginary.

μένους τά τε ὅπλα παρείλοντο πάντων πλὴν τῶν τρισχιλίων, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις πολὺ πρὸς ὠμότητα καὶ πονηρίαν ἐπέδοσαν. πρέσβεις ⟨δὲ⟩ πέμψαντες εἰς Λακεδαίμονα τοῦ τε Θηραμένους κατηγόρουν καὶ βοηθεῖν αὐτοῖς ἠξίουν· ὧν ἀκούσαντες οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι Καλλίβιον ἀπέστειλαν ἁρμοστὴν καὶ στρατιώτας ὡς ἑπτακοσίους, οἳ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἐλθόντες ἐφρούρουν.

38. *Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καταλαβόντων τῶν ἀπὸ Φυλῆς τὴν Μουνιχίαν καὶ νικησάντων μάχῃ τοὺς μετὰ τῶν τριάκοντα βοηθήσαντας, ἐπαναχωρήσαντες μετὰ τὸ[ν] κίνδυνον οἱ ἐκ τοῦ ἄστεως καὶ συναθροισθέντες εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ τοὺς μὲν τριάκοντα κατέλυσαν, αἱροῦνται δὲ δέκα τῶν πολιτῶν αὐτοκράτορας ἐπὶ τὴν [τοῦ πο]λέμου κατάλυσιν. οἱ δὲ παραλα-*

20. *δέ*: not in MS., added by J. B. Mayor, Blass, Hude, H-L.; K-W. mark a lacuna before *πρέσβεις*, and van Leeuwen thinks the sentence belongs to the end of ch. 36. 22. *αὐτοῖς*: K-W. *αὑτοῖς*. XXXVIII. 2. **Μουνιχίαν**: MS. *μουνυχιαν*, and so l. 20; *cf.* 19, l. 6. 4. *συναθροισθέντες*: MS. apparently *συνασοροισθεντες*.

18. *τά τε ὅπλα παρείλοντο*: Xenophon (II. 3. 20) represents this as having taken place before the death of Theramenes.

23. *Καλλίβιον ἀπέστειλαν*: this is in very marked contradiction to Xenophon, who places the sending of a Spartan garrison quite early in the rule of the Thirty. In this point Xenophon's account (with which Diodorus agrees, XIV. 4) seems more probable than that of Aristotle, as it would hardly have been possible for the Thirty to have carried on their Reign of Terror without an armed force at their backs, whereas Aristotle represents it as having occurred while the whole body of Athenians was still in possession of weapons.

XXXVIII. 7. *οἱ δὲ παραλαβόντες κ.τ.λ.*: Aristotle gives a fuller account than Xenophon of the proceedings of the Ten, which makes it easy to understand why they were eventually excluded from the amnesty (see ch. 39, l. 28). As a matter of fact their rule extended over nearly half the total time occupied by the anarchy. Lysias (*contr. Eratosth.* §§ 55–62) describes their proceedings in terms which fully confirm Aristotle, but he does not mention the second board of Ten, which eventually put an end to the civil war (see below).

βόντες τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐφ' οἷς μὲν ᾑρέθησαν οὐκ ἔπραττον,
ἐ[πρέσβευ]σ[αν] δ' εἰς Λακεδαίμονα βοήθειαν μετα-
πε[μπόμ]ενοι καὶ χρήματα δανειζόμενοι. χαλεπῶς 2
δὲ [φε]ρόντων ἐπὶ τούτοις τῶν ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ,
φο[βούμεν]οι μὴ καταλυθῶσιν τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ βου-
λόμενοι κατ[απλῆξ]αι τοὺς ἄλλους (ὅπερ ἐγένετο),
συλλαβόντες [Δ]ημάρετον οὐδενὸς ὄντα δεύτερον
τῶν πολιτῶν ἀπέκτειναν, καὶ τὰ πράγματα βεβαίως
εἶχον, συναγωνιζομένου Καλλιβίου τε καὶ τῶν Πελο-
ποννησίων τῶν παρόντων καὶ πρὸς τού[τοι]ς ἐνίων
τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἱππεῦσι· τούτων γάρ τινες μάλιστα τῶν
πολιτῶν ἐσπούδαζον μὴ κατελθεῖν τοὺς ἀπὸ Φυλῆς.
ὡς δ' οἱ τὸν Πειραιέα καὶ τὴν Μουνιχίαν ἔχοντες 3
ἀποστάντος ἅπαντος τοῦ δήμου πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐπε-
κράτουν τῷ πολέμῳ, τότε καταλύσαντες τοὺς δέκα
τοὺς πρώτους αἱρεθέντας, ἄλλους εἵλοντο δέκα
τοὺς βελτίστους εἶναι δοκοῦντας, ἐφ' ὧν συνέβη
καὶ τὰς διαλύσεις γενέσθαι καὶ κατελθεῖν τὸν δῆ-
[Col. 18.] *μον, συναγωνιζομένων καὶ προθυμουμένων τούτων.*
προειστήκεσαν δ' αὐτῶν μάλιστα Ῥίνων τε ὁ

8. *ἐφ'*: MS. *εν*. 9. *ἐπρέσβευσαν*; H-L. *ἔπεμψαν*, thinking the space not sufficient for the longer word. 10. *δανειζόμενοι*: MS. *δανιζομενοι*. The same spelling recurs in 6, l. 11, 52, l. 16, but in 9, l. 4 and 16, l. 7 the diphthong is used. 13. After *βουλόμενοι* the phrase *μὴ . . . βουλόμενοι* has been repeated in the MS., but the repetition is cancelled. 14. *Δημάρετον*: so K-W., H-L., after Blass. 16. *συναγωνιζομένου*: H-L. *συναγωνιζομένων*, thinking the termination uncertain in the MS. *Πελοποννησίων*: MS. *πελοποννησων*. 21. *ἅπαντος*: so rightly read by Blass; 1st ed., K-W., H-L. *παντός*. *αὐτὴν*: Blass, Kontos, Hude, H-L., K-W. *αὐτούς*.

23. *ἄλλους εἵλοντο δέκα*: Xenophon makes no mention of this second board of Ten, who were apparently members of the moderate aristocratical party.

27. *Ῥίνων*: this person is mentioned incidentally by Isocrates (*in Callim.* § 6, p. 372) as *εἷς τῶν δέκα γενόμενος*, but Isocrates clearly knows of only one board of Ten, as he refers to them just before as the

Παιανιεὺς καὶ Φάϋλλος ὁ Ἀχερδούσιος· οὗτοι γὰρ πρὶν ἢ Πανσανίαν τ' ἀφικέσθαι διεπέμ[ποντ]ο πρὸς τοὺς ἐν Πειραιεῖ, καὶ ἀφικομένου συνεσπού-

4 *δασαν τὴν κάθοδον. ἐπὶ πέρας γὰρ ἤγαγε τὴν εἰρήνην καὶ τὰς διαλύσεις Πανσανίας ὁ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεὺς μετὰ τῶν δέκα διαλλακτῶν τῶν ὕστερον ἀφικομένων ἐκ Λακεδαίμονος, οὓς αὐτὸς ἐσπούδασεν ἐλθεῖν. οἱ δὲ πε[ρὶ] τὸν Ῥίνωνα διά τε τὴν εὔνοιαν τὴν εἰς τὸν δ[ῆμον] ἐπῃνέθησαν, καὶ λαβόντες τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ἐν ὀλιγαρχίᾳ τὰς εὐθύνας ἔδοσαν [ἐ]ν δημοκρατίᾳ, καὶ οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν ἐνεκάλεσε[ν αὐ]τοῖς οὔτε τῶν ἐν ἄστει μεινάντων οὔτε τῶν ἐκ Πειραιέως κατελθόντων, ἀλλὰ διὰ ταῦτα καὶ στρατηγὸς εὐθὺς ᾑρέθη Ῥίνων.*

39. *Ἐγένοντο δ' αἱ διαλύσεις ἐπ' Εὐκλείδου ἄρχοντος κατὰ τὰς συνθήκας τάσδε. τοὺς βουλομένους Ἀθηναίων τῶν ἐν ἄστει μεινάντων ἐξοικεῖν ἔχειν Ἐλευσῖνα ἐπιτίμους ὄντας καὶ κυρίους καὶ αὐτοκράτορας ἐ[αυ]τῶν καὶ τὰ αὑτῶν καρπου-*

28. Ἀχερδούσιος: MS. *αχερδους υιος.* The emendation is Mr. Bywater's. 29. ἤ: H-L. del., inserting *τε* here, after Richards. *τε*: J. B. Mayor, H-L. del., K-W. bracket. K-W. insert *τε* after *διεπέμποντο*. *τε* is required in the clause, and it is not clear how it could have been transferred to its present position from any other. 30. ἀφικομένου: MS. *αφικνομενους.* 32. Πανσανίας: H-L. del. Richards removes *ὁ . . . βασιλεύς* as a gloss. Neither change seems necessary. XXXIX. 3. Ἀθηναίων: written above the line, over the words which follow. It may be a mere explanation, and not part of the text; but it would be rather unnecessary as such, and probably belongs to the text. *Cf.* 27, l. 19 *τῷ βουλομένῳ Λακιαδῶν*, 29, l. 30 *οἱ ἐθέλοντες Ἀθηναίων*, which indicate that the proper place for insertion here is after *βουλομένους*. K-W. bracket, H-L. remove it. 5. ἑαυτῶν: so K-W. and Jackson, H-L. and Poland *ἁπάντων*. 1st ed. *ἐ[πὶ πᾶσ]ιν*, but the termination *των* is fairly certain.

successors of the Thirty (*ἦρχον μὲν γὰρ οἱ δέκα οἱ μετὰ τοὺς τριάκοντα καταστάντες*).

33. τῶν δέκα διαλλακτῶν: Xenophon (*Hell.* II. 4. 38) gives the number of Spartan commissioners as fifteen.

XXXIX. 1. ἐπ' Εὐκλείδου ἄρχοντος: *i.e.* late in the summer of 403 B.C.

μένους. τὸ δ' ἱερὸν εἶναι κοινὸν ἀμφοτέρων, ἐπι- 2
μελεῖσθαι δὲ Κήρυκας *καὶ* Εὐμολπίδας *κατὰ τὰ*
πάτρια. μὴ ἐξεῖναι δὲ μήτε τοῖς Ἐλευσίνοθεν *εἰς*
τὸ ἄστυ μήτε τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ ἄστεως Ἐλευσίναδε *ἰέναι*
πλὴν μυστηρίοις ἑκατέρους. συντελεῖν δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν
προσιόντων εἰς τὸ συμμαχικὸν καθάπερ τοὺς ἄλλους
Ἀθηναίους. *ἐὰν δέ τινες τῶν ἀπιόντων οἰκίαν* 3
λαμβάνωσιν Ἐλευσῖνι, *συμπείθειν τὸν κεκτημένον·*
ἐὰν δὲ μὴ συμβαίνωσιν ἀλλήλοις τιμητὰς ἑλέσθαι
τρεῖς ἑκάτερον, καὶ ἥντιν' ἂν οὗτοι τάξωσιν τιμὴν
λαμβάνειν. Ἐλευσινίων *δὲ συνοικεῖν οὓς ἂν οὗτοι*
βούλωνται. τὴν δ' ἀπογραφὴν εἶναι τοῖς βουλο- 4
μένοις ἐξοικεῖν, τοῖς μὲν ἐπιδ[ημ]οῦσιν ἀφ' ἧς
ἂν ὀμόσωσιν τοὺς ὅρκους δ[έκ]α ἡμερῶν, τὴν δ'
ἐξοίκησιν εἴκοσι, τοῖς δ' ἀποδημοῦσιν ἐπειδὰν ἐπι-
δημήσωσιν κατὰ ταὐτά. μὴ ἐξεῖναι δὲ ἄρχειν 5
μηδεμίαν ἀρχὴν τῶν ἐν τῷ ἄστει τὸν Ἐλευσῖνι
κατοικοῦντα πρὶν ἂν ἀπογράφηται πάλιν ἐν τῷ
[Col. 19.] *ἄστει κατοικεῖν. τὰς δὲ δίκας τοῦ φόνου εἶναι*

15. *ἑκάτερον*: MS. *εκατερων*, corr. Bury, Richards, K-W., H-L. 17. *βούλωνται*: MS. *βουλονται*. 19. *ὀμόσωσιν*: MS. *ομωσωσιν*. *δέκα*: so read by K-W., H-L.; 1st ed. *δι'* [*ἔπτ*]*α*. MS. uncertain, but if *δι'* were right it should be repeated with *εἴκοσι*. 23. *ἀπογράφηται*: MS. at first *απογραψηται* (which K-W. and H-L. retain), but apparently corrected. 24. *φόνου*: so corrected in the MS. from *πονου*.

10. *πλὴν μυστηρίοις ἑκατέρους*: in the margin there is a note, evidently referring to this passage, *δ' εἰσὶν ἐν ἔτει*. The phrase in the text would naturally be understood to refer to the Eleusinia alone, nor is it probable that anything more is intended. What are the four mysteries of which the commentator was thinking is another matter. A. Mommsen (*Heortologie der Athener*, p. 467) enumerates five, the greater and lesser Eleusinia, Thesmophoria, Arrephoria, and Helenephoria. Of these the last may be omitted, as the least important. Or *δ'* may be a mistake for *δύο*.

κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, εἴ τίς τινα † αὐτόχειρα ἐκτίσει 6 *ἱερώσας †. τῶν δὲ παρεληλυθότων μηδενὶ πρὸς μηδένα μνησικακεῖν ἐξεῖναι, πλὴν πρὸς τοὺς τριάκοντα καὶ τοὺς δέκα καὶ τοὺς ἕνδεκα καὶ τοὺς τοῦ Πειραιέως ἄρξαντας, μηδὲ πρὸς τούτους ἐὰν διδῶσιν εὐθύνας. εὐθύνας δὲ δοῦναι τοὺς μὲν ἐν Πειραιεῖ ἄρξαντας ἐν τοῖς ἐν Πειραιεῖ, τοὺς δ' ἐν τῷ ἄστει ἐν τοῖς τὰ τιμήματα παρεχομένοις. εἶθ' οὕτως ἐξοικεῖν τοὺς ἐθέλοντας. τὰ δὲ χρήματα ἃ ἐδανείσαντο εἰς τὸν πόλεμον ἑκατέρους ἀποδοῦναι χωρίς.*

40. *Γενομένων δὲ τοιούτων τῶν διαλύσεων, καὶ φοβουμένων ὅσοι μετὰ τῶν τριάκοντα συνεπολέμησαν, καὶ πολλῶν μὲν ἐπινοούντων ἐξοικεῖν ἀνα-*

25. *αὐτόχειρα ἐκτίσει ἱερώσας*: so MS., the letters *ιε* being a correction of what may have been *οτ* (*i. e.* *ὁ τρώσας*); K-W. read them *οισ*, H-L. *ση*. 1st ed. *αὐτοχειρὶ ⟨ἀπέκτονεν⟩ ἐκτίσει ἱερώσας*, K-W., H-L. *αὐτοχειρίᾳ ἔκτεινεν ἢ ἔτρωσεν*. 33. *τούς*: MS. *τους δε*. XL. 3. *μὲν ἐπινοούντων*: H-L. *ἐπινοούντων μέν*, after Blass.

28. *καὶ τοὺς δέκα*: Xenophon (*Hell.* II. 4. 38) does not name the Ten among the persons excluded from the amnesty, mentioning only the Thirty, the Eleven, and the Ten who had ruled in Piraeus. It is probably some confusion between the latter body and the successors of the Thirty in Athens that has caused the omission in Xenophon's list.

32. *ἐν τοῖς τὰ τιμήματα παρεχομένοις*: this is the reading of the MS., but it appears to be corrupt. It can, however, be emended by inserting *ἐν τῷ ἄστει* after *τοῖς*; the omission of the phrase is easily explained by its occurrence almost immediately before. Then if *ἐν τοῖς κ.τ.λ.* indicates the body before whom the accounts were to be rendered (and Dr. Sandys has pointed out that this is the proper meaning), the sense is simply that the magistrates of Piraeus were to render their accounts before the citizens rated in Piraeus, and the magistrates of the city before those rated in the city. Each magistrate would appear before a jury of the inhabitants of the district which he had administered.

εἶθ' οὕτως: this refers to the whole of the terms which have just been set forth as regulating the retirement to Eleusis of those who so desired.

βαλλομένων δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν εἰς τὰς ἐσχάτας ἡμέρας, ὅπερ εἰώθασιν ποιεῖν ἅπαντες, Ἀρχῖνος συνιδὼν τὸ πλῆθος καὶ βουλόμενος κατασχεῖν αὐτοὺς ὑφεῖλε τὰς ὑπολοίπους ἡμέρας τῆς ἀπογραφῆς, ὥστε συναναγκασθῆναι μένειν πολλοὺς ἄκοντας ἕως ἐθάρρησαν. καὶ δοκεῖ τοῦτό τε πολιτεύσασθαι 2
καλῶς Ἀρχῖνος, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα γραψάμενος τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ Θρασυβούλου παρανόμων, ἐν ᾧ μετεδίδου τῆς πολιτείας πᾶσι τοῖς ἐκ Πειραιέως συγκατελθοῦσι, ὧν ἔνιοι φανερῶς ἦσαν δοῦλοι· καὶ τρίτον ἐπεί τις ἤρξατο τῶν κατεληλυθότων μνησικακεῖν, ἀπαγαγὼν τοῦτον ἐπὶ τὴν βουλὴν καὶ πείσας ἄκριτον ἀποκτεῖναι, λέγων ὅτι νῦν δείξουσιν εἰ βούλονται τὴν δημοκρατίαν σῴζειν καὶ τοῖς ὅρκοις ἐμμένειν· ἀφέντας μὲν γὰρ τοῦτον προτρέψειν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους, ἐὰν δ' ἀνέλωσιν παράδειγμα ποιήσειν ἅπασιν. ὅπερ καὶ συνέπεσεν· ἀποθανόντος γὰρ οὐδεὶς πώποτε ὕστερον ἐμνησικάκησεν. ἀλλὰ δοκοῦ- 3
σιν κάλλιστα δὴ καὶ πολιτικώτατα ἁπάντων καὶ ἰδίᾳ

4. ἀναγραφήν: Jackson, Wyse, H-L., K-W. ἀπογραφήν, but there does not seem to be any reason why the word should not have been varied, and ἀναγραφή is perfectly satisfactory in sense. 17. σῴζειν: MS. σωζειν. 18. τοῦτον: there is an erasure in the MS. in the middle of this word, the scribe having apparently written τουτου at first. 22. καὶ ἰδίᾳ: corrected in the MS. from καιδια.

XL. 5. Ἀρχῖνος: this particular action of Archinus is not recorded elsewhere, but emphatic testimony is borne to his character by the orators. Isocrates (*in Callim.* § 2, p. 371) speaks of a law of his to prevent συκοφαντία after the amnesty, of which his prosecution of a breach of the amnesty mentioned below appears to be the corollary; and Aeschines (*contr. Ctes.* § 196, p. 82) mentions him as having prosecuted Thrasybulus for an illegal proposition to crown one of his friends. He is also said by Suidas to have been the person who advised the adoption of the Ionic alphabet in public documents in the archonship of Eucleides.

καὶ κοινῇ χρήσασθαι ταῖς προγεγενημέναις συμφοραῖς· οὐ γὰρ μόνον τὰς περὶ τῶν προτέρων αἰτίας ἐξήλειψαν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ χρήματα Λακεδαιμονίοις, ἃ οἱ τριάκοντα πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἔλαβον, ἀπέδοσαν κοινῇ, κελευουσῶν τῶν συνθηκῶν ἑκατέρους ἀποδιδόναι χωρὶς τούς τ' ἐκ τοῦ ἄστεως καὶ τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ Πειραιέως, ἡγούμενοι τοῦτο πρῶτον ἄρχειν δεῖν τῆς ὁμονοίας· ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἄλλαις πόλεσιν οὐχ οἷον ἔτι προστιθέασιν τῶν οἰκείων οἱ δημοκρατήσαντες, ἀλλὰ
4 *καὶ τὴν χώραν ἀνάδαστον ποιοῦσιν. διελύθησαν* [Col. 20.]
δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι [ἐξοι]κήσαντας ἔτει τρίτῳ μετὰ τὴν ἐξοίκησιν, ἐπὶ [Ξεναι]νέτου ἄρχοντος.

41. *Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς ὕστε[ρο]ν συνέβη γενέσθαι καιροῖς, τότε δὲ κύριος ὁ δῆμος γενόμενος τῶν πραγμάτων ἐνεστήσατο τὴν [νῦν] οὖσαν πολιτείαν, ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρου μὲν ἄρχοντος, [δ]οκοῦντος δὲ*

28. *ἄστεως*: the first two letters are repeated in the MS., at the end of one line and the beginning of the next. 29. *δεῖν*: corrected in the MS. from *δεν*. 30. *ἔτι*: K-W. *ἐπιπροστιθέασιν*, J. B. Mayor *ὅτι*, removing *οἷον* as post-Aristotelean. 31. *δημοκρατήσαντες*: Hude, K-W., H-L. *δῆμοι κρατήσαντες*. 33. *ἐν*: added above the line, and perhaps would be better away; *cf.* Cobet (*Var. Lectt.* pp. 30, 201), who would remove the preposition in all such cases where it appears in MSS. H-L. cancel it.

31. *προστιθέασιν τῶν οἰκείων*: *i.e.* not only do they not make any superfluous contributions to public ends out of their own pockets, but on the contrary they make a redistribution of the property of the defeated oligarchs among themselves.

33. *ἔτει τρίτῳ*: 401 B.C. Xenophon (*Hell.* II. 4. 43) says merely *ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ*, and the final overthrow of the Thirty at Eleusis has been generally supposed to have followed within a few months after the re-establishment of the democracy.

XLI. 4. *ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρου*: Aristotle has already stated (ch. 39, l. 1) that the convention by which the democracy was restored took place in the year of Eucleides, and this certainly seems to have been the case. The Piraeus was no doubt re-occupied in the archonship of Pythodorus, but nothing was done towards re-establishing the democratic constitution

*δικαίως τοῦ δήμου λαβεῖν τὴν [ἐξουσί]αν διὰ τὸ
ποιήσασθαι τὴν κάθοδον δι' αὐτὸν τὸν δῆμον. ἦν* 2
δὲ τῶν μεταβολῶν ἑνδεκάτη τὸ[ν ἀρι]θμὸν αὕτη. πρώτη μὲν γὰρ ἐγένετο [ἡ κ]ατάστασις τῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς Ἴωνος καὶ τῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ συνοικισάντων· τότε γὰρ πρῶτον εἰς τὰς τέτταρας συνενεμήθησαν φυλὰς καὶ τοὺς φυλοβασιλέας κατέστησαν. δευτέρα δὲ καὶ πρώτη μετὰ ταύτη[ν] ἔχουσα πολιτείας τάξιν

XLI. 5. *ἐξουσίαν*: H.-L *προστασίαν*. 6. *τὸν δῆμον*: bracketed by K-W. 8. *ἡ κατάστασις τῶν*: MS. *καταταστις*. H-L. *τῶν καταστάσεων*, doubtfully, with no nominative article. 9. *συνοικισάντων*: Blass *συνοικησάντων*, from frag. 343; and K-W. and H-L. give *-κησ-* as the MS. reading, but apparently wrongly. *συνοικίζειν* is used here as in 15, l. 7 and Thuc. I. 24. VI. 5. 10. *τέτταρας*: MS. *τεσσαρας*, but elsewhere the form in *ττ* is used. 11. *φυλοβασιλέας*: so K-W., H-L., apparently rightly. 12. *μετὰ ταύτην ἔχουσα πολιτείας τάξιν*: MS. apparently *μετα ταυτα* (corr. to *ην*) *εχουσαι* (*ι* del.) *πολιτειαν ταξιν*. The scribe began to write the final *α* of *ταυτα*, but seems to have altered it to an *η* while writing. 1st ed. *μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξέχουσα*, *μετέχουσα* J. B. Mayor, *παρέχουσα* Wyse, Rutherford, *κατέχουσα* Blass, *εἶδος ἔχουσα* Poste; but the lacuna will not admit of any of these. *πολιτείας τάξιν* Wyse, *πολιτείαν τάξις* Rutherford, *μετρίαν τιν' ἔχουσα πολιτείας τάξιν* H-L., but the MS. will not admit of this. K-W. *μετὰ ταῦτα . . ἐχουσα πολιτείας τάξιν*.

till the following year, and the archonship of Eucleides was always taken as the date of the regeneration of Athens.

δοκοῦντος δὲ κ.τ.λ.: as the text stands, the only sense to be extracted from the passage is that the subsequent extension of the democracy (which is enlarged on below) was justified by the fact of its having secured its own re-establishment, without the open help of any other nation, and in the face of the opposition of a powerful party at Sparta. It may, however, be doubted whether the text is not corrupt. The repetition of *δήμου . . . δῆμον* is awkward and unnatural, and it is possible that the former word has taken the place of a proper name by a scribe's error; in which case the mutilated word given in the text as *ἐξουσίαν* should perhaps be altered to *προστασίαν* (which is adopted by H-L.), and *αὑτόν* would be read instead of *αὐτόν*. If this is correct, the name to be substituted for *δήμου* would presumably be that of Thrasybulus. K-W. bracket *τὸν δῆμον*, and mark a lacuna after *ἄρχοντος*, considering that originally there was some mention of the anathema under which the name of Pythodorus was placed.

11. *δευτέρα δὲ καὶ πρώτη*: the enumeration of the eleven *μεταβολαί* begins here, the constitution of Ion being taken as the original establishment and not a *μεταβολή*.

ἡ ἐπὶ Θησέως γενομένη, μικρὸν παρεγκλίνουσα τῆς βασιλικῆς. μετὰ δὲ ταύτην ἡ ἐπὶ Δράκοντος, ἐν ᾗ καὶ νόμους ἀνέγραψαν πρῶτον. τρίτη δ' ἡ μετὰ τὴν στάσιν ἡ ἐπὶ Σόλωνος, ἀφ' ἧς ἀρχὴ δημοκρατίας ἐγένετο. τετάρτη δ' ἡ ἐπὶ Πεισιστράτου τυραννίς. πέμπτη δ' ἡ μετὰ ⟨τὴν⟩ τῶν τυράννων κατάλυσιν ἡ Κλεισθένους, δημοτικωτέρα τῆς Σόλωνος. ἕκτη δ' ἡ μετὰ τὰ Μηδικά, τῆς ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλῆς ἐπιστατούσης. ἑβδόμη δὲ καὶ μετὰ ταύτην ἣν Ἀριστείδης μὲν ὑπέδειξεν, Ἐφιάλτης δ' ἐπετέλεσεν καταλύσας τὴν Ἀρεοπαγῖτιν βουλήν·

17. Πεισιστράτου: MS. πισιστρατου. 18. τήν: om. MS. 21. δὲ καί: J. B. Mayor, K-W., H-L. δὲ ἡ.

13. *μικρὸν παρεγκλίνουσα τῆς βασιλικῆς*: Aristotle's fuller account of Theseus is lost with the beginning of the MS., but Plutarch refers to him as saying that Theseus was the first to turn towards the people (*Thes.* 25, πρῶτος ἀπέκλινε πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης φησί, Rose, *Frag.* 346).

22. *ἣν Ἀριστείδης μὲν ὑπέδειξεν*: Aristides is mentioned as sketching out the lines which Ephialtes followed, because he initiated the process of admitting the lower orders to a share in political life, which Ephialtes carried to a further stage by the overthrow of the aristocratic stronghold in the Areopagus. It is of course not the case that Aristides is here represented as the colleague of Ephialtes in the reforms carried by the latter, as Rühl (*Rheinisches Museum*, XLVI. 432) appears to understand the passage. It is noticeable that Aristides is named and not Themistocles, and that wherever he is mentioned in this work the view taken of him is as more of a democratic reformer than is usual in modern histories, with the exception of Holm. In point of fact Aristides is far more important a person in reference to *constitutional* history than Themistocles. No constitutional alteration is ascribed to the latter except a share (subordinate, and for purely personal reasons) in the attack on the Areopagus, whereas Aristides certainly did something to give effect to the development of the democracy which was made inevitable by the Persian wars.

Ἐφιάλτης δ' ἐπετέλεσεν: it is remarkable that Aristotle regards Ephialtes, and not Pericles, as the founder of the thorough-going democracy of Athens. Pericles is not here named, and his reforms in the direction of extending the powers of the law-courts, and the

ἐν ᾗ πλεῖστα συνέβη τὴν πόλιν διὰ τοὺς δημαγωγοὺς ἁμαρτάνειν διὰ τὴν τῆς θαλάττης ἀρχήν. ὀγδόη δ' [ἡ] τῶν τετρακοσίων κατάστασις, καὶ μετὰ ταύτην ἐνάτη δὲ [δ]ημοκρατία πάλιν. δεκάτη δ' ἡ τῶν τριάκοντα καὶ ἡ τῶν δέκα τυραννίς. ἑνδεκάτη δ' ἡ μετὰ τὴν ἀπὸ Φυλῆς καὶ ἐκ Πειραιέως κάθοδον, ἀφ' ἧς διαγεγένηται μέχρι τῆς νῦν ἀεὶ προσεπιλαμβάνουσα τῷ πλήθει τὴν ἐξουσίαν. ἁπάντων γὰρ αὐτὸς αὑτὸν πεποίηκεν ὁ δῆμος κύριον καὶ πάντα διοικεῖται ψηφίσμασιν καὶ δικαστηρίοις, ἐν οἷς ὁ δῆμός ἐστιν ὁ κρατῶν· καὶ γὰρ α[ἱ τ]ῆς βουλῆς κρίσεις εἰς τὸν δῆμον ἐληλύθασιν. καὶ τοῦτο

25. διά: H-L. prefix καί, K-W. and Poste suspect a larger lacuna. Richards κατά for διά. θαλάττης: MS. θαλαλαττης. 26. ὀγδόη: MS. ογδοην. κατάστασις: MS. καταστασιν, and after κα a superflous repetition of the letters τασ has been erased. 27. δέ: K-W. bracket, H-L. omit, after Blass, *etc.*; *cf.* l. 21, ἑβδόμη δὲ καὶ μετὰ ταύτην. 28. ἡ: K-W. bracket. 30. τῆς: H-L. τοῦ.

institution of pay for service in them, are apparently classed with the other attempts of the demagogues to bid for the popular support by a free use of the public funds; while his naval policy (which is a characteristic expressly ascribed to him in ch. 27) is held to be the great cause of the fall of Athens. Aristotle unquestionably did not hold the high opinion of the statesmanship of Pericles which has been accepted in modern times, mainly, no doubt, on the strong testimony of Thucydides.

24. τὴν πόλιν: the third hand begins here. It is not so set as the second hand, but much larger and more straggling than the first; and it contains several blunders. In several cases, where a word has been badly written, it is re-written above in the corrector's hand.

32. πάντα διοικεῖται ψηφίσμασιν: *cf. Pol.* VI. (IV.) 4, p. 1292 a 34, ὥστ' εἴπερ ἐστὶ δημοκρατία μία τῶν πολιτειῶν, φανερὸν ὡς ἡ τοιαύτη κατάστασις, ἐν ᾗ ψηφίσμασι πάντα διοικεῖται.

35. καὶ τοῦτο κ.τ.λ.: Dr. Cauer interprets this as a general commendation of the unlimited democracy, and argues therefrom that this treatise cannot be the work of the Aristotle of the *Politics*; but there is no reason to apply the remark to anything except the transference of the jurisdiction of the Council to the Ecclesia, and as the Council was quite as much a democratic body as the Ecclesia there is nothing in this comment inconsistent with the views of Aristotle.

δοκοῦσι ποιεῖν ὀρθῶς· εὐδιαφθορώτεροι γὰρ ὀλίγοι
3 τῶν πολλῶν εἰσὶν κ[αὶ] κέρδει κ[αὶ] χάρισιν. μισθοφόρον δ' ἐκκλησίαν τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἀπέγνωσαν ποιεῖν· οὐ συλλεγομένων δ' εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἀλλὰ πολλὰ σοφιζομένων τῶν πρυτάνεων, ὅπως προσιστῆται τὸ πλῆθος πρὸς τὴν ἐπικύρωσιν τῆς [Col. 21.]
χειροτονίας, πρῶτον μὲν Ἀγύρριος ὀβολὸν ἐπόρισεν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Κλαζομένιος ὁ

36. *ὀλίγοι*: MS. *ολιγον*. K-W. and H-L. prefix *οἱ*. 38. *ἐκκλησίαν*: K-W. prefix *τήν*. 40. *σοφιζομένων*: so Blass, K-W., and so apparently MS.; 1st ed. and H-L. *ψηφιζομένων*, the latter adding *μόνων*. H-L. think *καίπερ* necessary with *σοφιζομένων*, but *ἀλλά* is quite sound: 'they did not come to the Ecclesia, but the prytanes had to try all sorts of devices to obtain a quorum, and so Agyrrhius' *etc*.

On the contrary, as Prof. O. Crusius has pointed out (*Philologus*, L. p. 175), it corresponds exactly with the opinion expressed in *Pol*. III. 15, p. 1286 a 28, *καθ' ἕνα μὲν οὖν συμβαλλόμενος ὁστισοῦν ἴσως χείρων· ἀλλ' ἐστὶν ἡ πόλις ἐκ πολλῶν . . . διὰ τοῦτο καὶ κρίνει ἄμεινον ὄχλος πολλὰ ἢ εἷς ὁστισοῦν. ἔτι μᾶλλον ἀδιάφθορον τὸ πολύ· καθάπερ ὕδωρ τὸ πλεῖον, οὕτω καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ὀλίγων ἀδιαφθορώτερον*.

42. *Ἀγύρριος*: Agyrrhius flourished in the early part of the fourth century and was *στρατηγός* in 389 B.C. It is clear from Aristophanes that the payment for attendance at the Ecclesia had been raised to three obols shortly before the performance of the Ecclesiazusae in 392 B.C.; and as the original establishment of the payment was the work of the same person who raised it to three obols, it is clear that it cannot have taken place much, if at all, before the end of the fifth century. H-L. suggest that possibly Aristotle may be speaking merely of a *revival* of the payment after the fall of the oligarchy; but seeing that no mention has been made of the *μισθὸς ἐκκλησιαστικός* hitherto the form of expression here, as they themselves admit, would in that case be extraordinarily misleading. Boeckh therefore is wrong in supposing that the payment of one obol began either in the latter part of the government of Pericles or soon afterwards, and also that the payment rose at once from one to three obols, without passing through the intermediate stage of two obols. The two obol payment, however, probably lasted only a very short time, and the point is not of importance except that Boeckh uses the supposed fact that the payment for the Ecclesia was never two obols, as an argument that the payment of the judges likewise rose at once from one to three obols.

43. *Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Κλαζομένιος*: mentioned in Plat. *Ion*, 541 D, as a

βασιλεὺς ἐπικαλουμενος διώβολον, πάλιν δ' Ἀγύρριος τριώβολον.

42. *Ἔχει δ' ἡ νῦν κατάστασις τῆς πολιτείας τόνδε τὸν τρόπον. μετέχουσιν μὲν τῆς πολιτείας οἱ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων γεγονότες ἀστῶν. ἐγγράφον[ται] δ' εἰς τοὺς δημότας ὀκτωκαίδεκα ἔτη γεγονότες· ὅταν δ' ἐγγράφωνται διαψηφίζονται περὶ αὐτῶν ὀμόσαντες οἱ δημόται, πρῶτον μὲν εἰ δοκοῦσι γεγονέναι τὴν ἡλικίαν τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου, κἂν μὴ δόξωσι ἀπέρχονται πάλιν εἰς παῖδα[ς, δ]εύτερον δ' εἰ ἐλεύθερός ἐστι καὶ γέγονε κατὰ [το]ὺς νόμους. ἔπειτ' ἂν μὲν ἐπιψηφίσωνται μὴ εἶναι ἐλεύθερον, ὁ μὲν ἐφίησιν εἰς τὸ*

XLII. 4. *ὀκτωκαίδεκα ἔτη*: corrected in the MS. from *οκτωκαιδεκαετεις*. 5. *δ' ἐγγράφωνται*: MS. *δε γραφωνται*, corr. Blass, H-L., K-W., *etc.* 9. *ἐπιψηφίσωνται*: *ἀποψηφίσωνται*, Blass, Wyse, K-W., H-L.

foreigner who had held office at Athens. *Cf.* Aelian, *V. H.* XIV. 5, Athen. XI. 506 A.

XLII. 1. *Ἔχει δ' ἡ νῦν κατάστασις*: here the second part of the treatise may be said to begin. The first part is a sketch of the constitutional history of Athens; the second is a description of the various details of the constitution as ultimately developed, and is mainly occupied with an enumeration of the several magistracies in existence and an account of their respective duties. This portion of the work has been a quarry from which the many ancient compilers of lexicons have drawn their materials. Pollux, Harpocration, Suidas, Hesychius, Photius, and several others embody a large number of fragments, sometimes with acknowledgment and sometimes without, of this part of Aristotle's treatise, and in many cases they enable us to supply gaps which have been caused by the unfortunately mutilated condition of the MS.

5. *διαψηφίζονται*: this passage is referred to by the scholiast on Aristophanes' *Wasps* 578, *Ἀριστοτέλης δέ φησιν ὅτι ψήφῳ οἱ ἐγγραφόμενοι δοκιμάζονται, νεώτεροι μὴ ἐτῶν ιη̅ εἶεν* (Rose, *Frag.* 427). The scholiast proceeds, *ἴσως δ' ἂν περὶ τῶν κρινομένων παίδων εἰς τοὺς γυμνικοὺς ἀγῶνας λέγει· οὐχ ὡς ἐν δικαστηρίῳ κρινομένων ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*: but here the subject of *λέγει* must be Aristophanes, not Aristotle.

9. *ἐπιψηφίσωνται*: if this reading be retained, it is a use of the verb which is only paralleled in late authors, *e.g.* Diod. 19, 61; Dion. H. 6, 71, 84 (quoted in L. and S.).

*δικαστήριον, οἱ δὲ δημόται κατηγόρους αἱροῦνται
πέντε [ἄν]δρας ἐξ αὐτῶν, κἂν μὲν μὴ δόξῃ δι[καί]ως
ἐγγράφ[εσ]θαι πωλεῖ τοῦτον ἡ πόλις· ἐὰν δὲ νικήσῃ*
2 *τοῖς [δη]μόταις ἐπάναγκες ἐγγράφεται. μετὰ δὲ
ταῦτα δοκιμάζει τοὺς ἐγγραφέντας ἡ βουλή, κἄν τις
δόξ[ῃ ν]εώτερος ὀκτωκαίδεκα ἐτῶν εἶναι ζημιοῖ [τοὺ]ς
δημότας τοὺς ἐγγράψαντας. ἐπὰν δὲ δοκιμα[σθ]ῶ-
σιν οἱ ἔφηβοι, συλλεγέντες οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν
κατὰ φυλὰς ὀμόσαντες αἱροῦνται τρεῖς ἐκ τῶν φυ-
λετῶν τῶν ὑπὲρ τετταράκοντα ἔτη γεγονότων οὓς ἂν
ἡγῶνται βελτίστους εἶναι καὶ ἐπιτηδειοτάτους ἐπι-
μελεῖσθαι τῶν ἐφήβων, ἐκ δὲ τούτων ὁ δῆμος ἕνα
τῆ[ς φ]υλῆς ἑκάστης χειροτονεῖ σωφρονιστὴν καὶ
κοσμητὴν ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ πάντα.*
3 *συλλαβόντες δ' οὗτοι τοὺς ἐφήβους, πρῶτον μὲν τὰ
ἱερὰ περιῆλθον, εἶτ' εἰς Πειραιέα πορεύονται καὶ
φρουροῦσιν οἱ μὲν τὴν Μουνιχίαν οἱ δὲ τὴν ἀκτήν.
χειρο[τονεῖ] δὲ καὶ παιδοτρίβας αὐτοῖς δύο καὶ
διδασκάλους, [οἵ]τινες ὁπλομαχεῖν καὶ τοξεύειν καὶ
ἀκοντίζειν κ[αὶ] καταπάλτην ἀφιέναι διδάσκουσιν.
δίδωσι δὲ καὶ εἰς τρο[φὴν] τοῖς μὲν σωφρονισταῖς*

14. *ἐγγράφεται*: H-L. *ἐγγράφειν*, but the adverbial use of *ἐπάναγκες* is quite established. 17. *ἐπάν*: H-L. *ἐπειδάν*. 20. *τετταράκοντα*: MS. *τετταρακοτα*. 24. *κοσμητήν*: so apparently MS., as read by Paton, K-W., H-L.; 1st ed. [*ἐπιμ*]*ελητήν*. *πάντα συλλαβόντες*: so apparently MS., though *πάντας* (K-W.) is not impossible. H-L. *πάντας παραλαβόντες*, against the traces in the MS. 27. *Μουνιχίαν*: MS. *μουνυχιαν*. 29. *οἵτινες*: K-W. *τ*[*έτ*]*τ*[*α*]*ρας* ⟨*οἵ*⟩, but the MS. is practically certain. 30. *καταπάλτην*: MS. *καταπελτην* (not *-παλτην*, as H-L. affirm) corrected from *κατην*. *Cf.* Meisterhans, p. 12. *διδάσκουσιν*: *διδάξουσιν* H-L., following Rutherford.

27. *τὴν ἀκτήν*: this was the name given to the peninsula which incloses the harbour of Piraeus on the east and south; *cf.* ch. 61, l. 9, and Wachsmuth, *Die Stadt Athen*, I. 316.

δραχμὴν μίαν ἑκάστῳ, τοῖς δ' ἐφήβοις τέτταρας
ὀβολοὺς ἑκάστῳ· τὰ δὲ τῶν φυλετῶν τῶν αὑτοῦ
λαμβάνων ὁ σωφρονιστὴς ἕκαστος ἀγοράζει τὰ ἐπι-
τήδεια πᾶσιν εἰς τὸ κοινόν (συσσιτοῦσι γὰρ κατὰ
φυλάς), καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιμελεῖται πάντων. καὶ 4
τὸν μὲν πρῶτον ἐνιαυτὸν οὕτως διάγουσι· τὸν δ'
ὕστερον, ἐκκλησίας ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ γενομένης, ἀπο-
[Col. 22.] *δειξάμενοι τῷ δήμῳ τὰ περὶ τὰς τάξεις καὶ λαβόντες*
ἀσπίδα καὶ δόρυ παρὰ τῆς πόλεως περιπολοῦσι τὴν
χώραν καὶ διατρίβουσιν ἐν τοῖς φυλακτηρίοις.
φρουροῦσι δὲ τὰ δύο ἔτη, χλαμύδας ἔχοντες, καὶ 5
ἀτελεῖς εἰσὶ πάντων· καὶ δί[κη]ν οὔτ[ε] διδόασιν
οὔτε λαμβάνουσιν, ἵνα μὴ πρ[όφ]ασις ᾖ τοῦ ἀπιέναι,
πλὴν περὶ κλήρου καὶ ἐπικλή[ρου], κἂν τινι
κατὰ τὸ γένος ἱερωσύνη γένηται. διεξελθόντων

32. *δραχμὴν μίαν*: MS. ⟨α. 36. *ἐπιμελεῖται*: MS. *επιμεληται*. 37. *τὸν δ' ὕστερον*: *τὸν δεύτερον ἐνιαυτόν* Harpocration, followed by K-W. 38. *γενομένης*: badly written in MS., and almost equally badly re-written. *ἀποδειξάμενοι*: H-L. *ἐπιδειξάμενοι*. 39. *τά*: om. Harp. 40. *τῆς πόλεως*: *τοῦ δήμου* Harp. 44. *πρόφασις ᾖ τοῦ ἀπιέναι*: so excellently read by Blass. 46. *ἱερωσύνη*: MS. *ιεροσυνη*. *διεξελθόντων*: H-L. *διελθ-*.

32. *δραχμὴν μίαν*: the same sum is also named as the pay of the Sophronistae in Lex. Seg. p. 301, and Photius (*s. v. σωφρονισταί*). *Cf.* Boeckh (*Staatsh.*[3] I. 304, bk. II. 16).

38. *ἐκκλησίας . . . φυλακτηρίοις*: this passage is quoted by Harpocration (*s. v. περίπολος*) as from Aristotle's Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία (Rose, *Frag.* 428). Harpocration continues, *παρατηρητέον οὖν ὅτι ὁ μὲν* Ἀριστοτέλης *ἕνα φησὶν ἐνιαυτὸν ἐν τοῖς περιπόλοις γίγνεσθαι τοὺς ἐφήβους, ὁ δὲ* Αἰσχίνης *δύο· καὶ τάχα διὰ τοῦτο ἐπεμνήσθη τοῦ πράγματος ὁ ῥήτωρ, καίπερ πάντων τῶν ἐφήβων ἐξ ἀνάγκης περιπολούντων, ὅτι αὐτὸς δύο ἔτη γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς περιπόλοις· διὸ καὶ μαρτυρῶν ἐδήλωσεν αὐτό.* Aeschines (*de Fals. Leg.* p. 50 § 178) probably, however, uses the term *περίπολος* loosely to cover the two years during which the ephebi *φρουροῦσι* (ll. 27, 42).

42. *χλαμύδας*: the chlamys was the distinctive garment of the ephebi, and is often referred to as such; *e.g.* the epitaph of Meleager on a youth whom his mother *ὀκτωκαιδεκέταν ἐστόλισεν χλαμύδι* (*Anth. Pal.* VII. 468). *Cf.* Liddell and Scott, *s. v.*

δὲ τῶν δυεῖν ἐτῶν ἤδη μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων εἰσίν. τὰ μὲν οὖν περὶ τὴν τῶν πολιτῶν ἐγγραφὴν καὶ τοὺς ἐφήβους τοῦτον ἔχει τὸν τρόπον.

43. Τὰς δ' ἀρχὰς τὰς περὶ τὴν ἐγκύκλιον διοίκησιν ἁπάσας ποιοῦσι κληρωτάς, πλὴν ταμίου στρατιωτικῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικὸν καὶ τοῦ τῶν κρηνῶν ἐπιμελητοῦ. ταύτας δὲ χειροτονοῦσιν, καὶ οἱ χειροτονηθέντες ἄρχουσιν ἐκ Παναθηναίων εἰς

XLIII. 2. κληρωτάς: MS. πληρωτας. ταμίου στρατιωτικῶν: Richards τοῦ ταμίου τῶν στρατιωτικῶν, but it is hardly likely that two articles so close together would have dropped out accidentally. 4. κρηνῶν: H-L. κοινῶν, after Headlam.

XLIII. 3. τῶν ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικόν: this passage and that in ch. 47, l. 12 are decisive against the belief of Fraenkel (note to Boeckh's *Staatshaushaltung*, 3rd ed. I. 225) and Gilbert (I. 230) that there was only one officer ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικόν for each year.

τοῦ τῶν κρηνῶν ἐπιμελητοῦ: this title only occurs elsewhere in *Pol.* VII. (VI.) 8, p. 1321 b 26, in a passage of general application, and has not been known hitherto as the name of an Athenian officer. It is presumably identical with that of ἐπιστάτης ὑδάτων, which Plutarch mentions as having been held by Themistocles (*Them.* 31). Pollux (VIII. 112) speaks of a κρηνοφυλάκιον ἀρχή, but does not say whether it consisted of a single officer or of a board. Athens was very scantily supplied with fresh water, and therefore the superintendence of the aqueducts and reservoirs was a matter of great importance, which could not be entrusted to an officer appointed by lot. Photius and Hesychius mention κρηνοφύλακες, who were probably the subordinates of the κρηνῶν ἐπιμελητής. Headlam, however, followed by H-L., would substitute κοινῶν for κρηνῶν, believing that the officer ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει is mentioned. But if that post existed officially at this date, it is incredible that it should be passed over with so casual a mention; and (unless there is really a lacuna before ch. 61, *q.v.*) Keil must be right in holding that the *title* is of later date than Lycurgus. Moreover H-L. further weaken their case by noting that the word ταμίας should have been used, not ἐπιμελητής, and propose to delete ἐπιμελητοῦ. To delete ἐπιμελητοῦ and alter κρηνῶν is hardly a justifiable way of treating the text.

5. ἄρχουσιν ἐκ Παναθηναίων: the Panathenaic festival was at the end of Hecatombaeon, the first month of the Attic year. The magistrates elected by lot presumably came into office on the first of that month.

Παναθήναια. χειροτονοῦσι δὲ καὶ τὰς πρὸς τὸν
πόλεμον ἁπάσας. βουλὴ δὲ κληροῦται φ̄, ν̄ ἀπὸ 2
φυλῆς ἑκάστης. πρυτανεύει δ' ἐν μέρει τῶν φυλῶν
ἑκάστη καθ' ὅ τι ἂν λάχωσιν, αἱ μὲν πρῶται τέτ-
ταρες ἓξ καὶ λ̄ ἡμέρας ἑκάστη, αἱ δὲ ϛ̄ αἱ ὕστεραι
πέντε καὶ λ̄ ἡμέρας ἑκάστη· κατὰ σελήνην γὰρ
ἄγουσιν τὸν ἐνιαυτόν. οἱ δὲ πρυτανεύοντες αὐτῶν 3
πρῶτον μὲν συσσιτοῦσιν ἐν τῇ θόλῳ, λαμβάνοντες
ἀργύριον παρὰ τῆς πόλεως, ἔπειτα συνάγουσιν καὶ

14. *καί*: the reading is not clear, the letters visible more resembling *ει*, but *καί* is usually written in a very irregular manner in this hand. H-L. read *εἰς* (as 1st ed.) and cancel it.

The archons certainly did so; as appears, for instance, from Antiphon *De Choreut.* § 44, p. 146.

ἐκ Παναθηναίων εἰς Παναθήναια: this phrase, as appears from official inscriptions (C. I. A. I. 32, 117 ff., 273), indicates a four-year period, from one great Panathenaea to the next. This contradicts Boeckh's view that the officials *ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικόν* were annual, and if the date of one of these officials is indicated by reference to an archon (Aeschin. *contr. Ctes.* § 24, *Vit. X. Orat.*, *Lycurg.* § 27), it no doubt refers to the year of his election, there being no other means of stating his date.

8. *πρυτανεύει κ.τ.λ.*: Harpocration (*s. v. πρυτανεία*), after stating the number of days in each prytany, adds, *διείλεκται δὲ περὶ τούτων Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ.* The scholiast to Plato's *Laws* (p. 459) appears to have drawn from this passage of Aristotle, and he uses almost the exact phrase, *κατὰ σελήνην γὰρ ἄγουσι τὸν ἐνιαυτόν*, which occurs below. *Cf.* Rose, *Frag.* 393.

9. *αἱ μὲν πρῶται κ.τ.λ.*: this statement as to the number of days in each prytany is repeated by Photius, but it is at variance with an inscription quoted by Clinton (*Fast. Hell.* II. 345) which contains an account of moneys expended in the archonship of Glaucippus (410 B.C.); for explicit mention is made there of a thirty-sixth day in the eighth, ninth, and tenth prytanies, which would show that at that date the last four prytanies, and not the first four, were the longest. The statement of Aristotle is, however, equally explicit, and it only remains to conclude that a change was made at some time between 410 B.C. and the middle of the following century, of which Aristotle is speaking.

14. *συνάγουσιν . . ἑκάστης*: Harpocration (*s. v. κυρία ἐκκλησία*) quotes this passage, naming the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* as his authority (Rose, *Frag.* 395). Pollux (VIII. 95, 96) gives a summary of the rest of the

τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον· τὴν μὲν οὖν βουλὴν ὅσαι ἡμέραι, πλὴν ἐάν τις ἀφέσιμος ᾖ, τὸν δὲ δῆμον τετράκις τῆς πρυτανείας ἑκάστης. καὶ ὅσ[α] δεῖ χρηματίζειν τὴν βουλήν, καὶ ὅ τι ἐν ἑκάστῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ,
4 *καὶ ὅ τι οὐ καθήκει οὗτοι προγράφουσι. προγράφουσι δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας οὗτοι, μίαν μὲν κυρίαν, ἐν ᾗ δεῖ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἐπιχειροτονεῖν εἰ δοκοῦσι καλῶς ἄρχειν, καὶ περὶ σίτου καὶ περὶ φυλακῆς τῆς χώρας χρηματίζειν, καὶ τὰς εἰσαγγελίας ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοὺς βουλομένους ποιεῖσθαι, καὶ τὰς ἀπογραφὰς τῶν δημευομένων ἀναγιγνώσκειν, καὶ τὰς λήξεις τῶν κλήρων καὶ τῶν ἐπικλήρων ἀναγιγνώσκειν, [ὅπω]ς μηδένα*
5 *λάθῃ μηδὲν ἔρημον γενόμενον. ἐπὶ [δὲ] τῆς ἕκτης πρυτανείας πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις καὶ περὶ τῆς ὀστρακο-*

15. *οὖν*: om. Harp., H-L., K-W., but *cf. Poet.* 22, 1458a 25, and other instances of similar use of *μὲν οὖν* in *Index Aristotelicus*, p. 540b (cited by Newman). 16. *ἐάν*: MS. *εναν*. 18. *χρηματίζειν*: MS. *χρηματιζει*. 19. *ὅ τι οὐ καθήκει*: the 4th and 5th letters are doubtful; K-W. read *καθειζει* (=*καθίζει*) and restore *ὅπου καθίζειν*, and this is perhaps the best solution. 25, 26. *ἀναγιγνώσκειν* (*bis*): MS. *αναγινωσκειν*. K-W. bracket the repetition in l. 26. 28. *εἰρημένοις*: MS. *ηρημενοις*.

chapter and the beginning of the next, generally using Aristotle's words, though without naming him as his authority (*Frag.* 394).

15. *ὅσαι ἡμέραι*: this phrase, instead of the adverb *ὁσημέραι*, does not seem to occur before Themistius (L. and S.); but, as has been pointed out by Mr. J. B. Mayor, it facilitates the following *τις*, and it is retained by K-W. and H-L.

19. *καθήκει*: if the reading is correct, the meaning is 'what subjects are not suitable.'

προγράφουσι δὲ κ.τ.λ.: Harpocration, after the passage quoted just above (*cf.* note on l. 14) proceeds, *προγράφουσι δέ, φησί, καὶ κυρίαν ἐκκλησίαν, ἐν ᾗ δεῖ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἀποχειροτονεῖν οἳ δοκοῦσι μὴ καλῶς ἄρχειν, καὶ περὶ φυλακῆς δὲ τῆς χώρας· καὶ τὰς εἰσαγγελίας ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοὺς βουλομένους ποιεῖσθαί φησι καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς*, which is a slightly paraphrased version of the present passage (Rose, *Frag.* 395). The Lex. rhet. Cantabrig. also refers to Aristotle, *s. v. κυρία ἐκκλησία*, and quotes the greater part of this passage, including the mention of the *ὀστρακοφορία* below (Rose, *Frag.* 396), though not with verbal exactness.

φορίας ἐπιχειροτονίαν διδόασιν εἰ δοκεῖ ποιεῖν ἢ μή,
καὶ συκοφαντῶν προβολὰς τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν με-
τοίκων μέχρι τριῶν ἑκατέρ[ων, κἄν τι]ς ὑποσχόμενός
τι μὴ ποιήσῃ τῷ δήμῳ. ἑτέραν δὲ ταῖς ἱκετηρίαις, 6
ἐν ᾗ θεὶς ὁ βουλόμενος ἱκετηρίαν ὧν ἂν βούληται
[Col. 23.] *καὶ ἰδίων καὶ δημοσίων διαλέξεται πρὸς τὸν δῆμον.*
αἱ δὲ δύο περὶ τῶν ἄλλων εἰσίν, ἐν αἷς κελεύουσιν οἱ

29. *ἐπιχειροτονίαν*: so also the MS. of the Lex. rhet. Cantabrig., but the editors of the latter have unanimously altered it to *προχειροτονίαν*, whence K-W. introduce the latter reading here 'e lex. Cant.' The MS. of Aristotle confirms the MS. of the Lexicon, and illustrates the danger of conjectural emendation. 32. *τι μή*: the original scribe appears to have written *τιμαι* or *ειμαι*, which the corrector has altered to *τι μη* or *τιμηι*. In any case, however, the former must be the true reading. *ἑτέραν δέ*: H-L. *ἑτέρα δ' ἐστί*, but the space will not admit it, and the other reading seems traceable in the MS. 33. *ὁ*: MS. *ου*. *ὧν ἄν*: K-W. prefix *περί*, which the space will not admit of; H-L. *υ'*, i. e. *ὑπέρ*, which the space will admit, but there is no trace of writing on it. 34. *διαλέξεται*: MS. *διαδεξεται*, H-L. *διαλέγεται*.

30. *συκοφαντῶν προβολάς*: this form of procedure against *συκοφάνται* is mentioned by Aeschines (*De Fals. Leg.* § 153, p. 47), *τῶν συκοφαντῶν ὡς κακούργων δημοσίᾳ προβολὰς ποιούμεθα*, and Pollux (VIII. 46), *προβολαὶ δὲ ἦσαν καὶ αἱ τῆς συκοφαντίας γραφαί.* No mention, however, seems to be made anywhere of the limitation here described of the number of such complaints that could be heard at one sitting of the ecclesia. *Cf.* Schömann *De comitiis Atheniensium*, p. 232 *seq.*

31. *κἄν τις κ.τ.λ.*: this law is mentioned by Demosthenes (*in Lept.* § 100, p. 487), *ἔστι δὲ δήπου νόμος ὑμῖν, ἐάν τις ὑποσχόμενός τι τὸν δῆμον ἢ τὴν βουλὴν ἢ δικαστήριον ἐξαπατήσῃ, τὰ ἔσχατα πάσχειν*: *cf.* [Dem.] *in Timoth.* § 67, p. 1204, *νόμων ὄντων, ἐάν τις τὸν δῆμον ὑποσχόμενος ἐξαπατήσῃ, εἰσαγγελίαν εἶναι περὶ αὐτοῦ.*

33. *ὁ βουλόμενος*: the paraphrase of the present passage given by Pollux (VIII. 96) runs, *ἡ δὲ δευτέρα ἐκκλησία ἀνεῖται τοῖς βουλομένοις, ἱκετηρίαν θεμένοις, λέγειν ἀδεῶς περί τε τῶν ἰδίων καὶ τῶν δημοσίων.*

35. *αἱ δὲ δύο κ.τ.λ.*: according to Pollux (*l.c.*) the third ecclesia in each prytany was assigned to the hearing of heralds and embassies, and the fourth to *ἱερὰ καὶ ὅσια.* But this subdivision is not stated by Aristotle, and is inconsistent with the passage in Aesch. I. 23 (*in Timarch.* p. 4), *ἐπειδὰν τὸν καθάρσιον περιενεχθῇ καὶ ὁ κῆρυξ τὰς πατρίους εὐχὰς εὔξηται, προχειροτονεῖν κελεύει τοὺς προέδρους περὶ ἱερῶν τῶν πατρίων καὶ κήρυξι καὶ πρεσβείαις καὶ ὁσίων.*

νόμοι τρία μὲν ἱερῶν χρηματίζειν, τρία δὲ κήρυξιν καὶ πρεσβείαις, τρία δʼ ὁσίων. χρηματίζουσιν δʼ ἐνίοτε καὶ ἄνευ προχειροτονίας. προσέρχονται δὲ καὶ οἱ κήρυκες καὶ οἱ πρέσβεις τοῖς πρυτάνεσιν πρῶτον, καὶ οἱ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς φέροντες τούτοις ἀποδιδόασι.

44. *Ἔστι δʼ ἐπιστάτης τῶν πρυτάνεων εἷς ὁ λαχών· οὗτος δʼ ἐπιστατεῖ νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν οὔτε πλείω χρόνον οὔτε δὶς τὸν αὐτὸν γενέσθαι. τηρεῖ δʼ οὗτος τάς τε κλεῖς τὰς τῶν ἱερῶν ἐν οἷς τὰ χρήματʼ ἐστὶν καὶ γράμματα τῇ πόλει, καὶ τὴν δημοσίαν σφραγῖδα, καὶ μένειν ἀναγκαῖον ἐν τῇ θόλῳ τοῦτόν ἐστιν καὶ τριττὺν τῶν πρυτάνεων ἣν*
2 *ἂν οὗτος κελεύῃ. καὶ ἐπειδὰν συναγάγωσιν οἱ πρυτάνεις τὴν βουλὴν ἢ τὸν δῆμον οὗτος κληροῖ προέδρους ἐννέα, ἕνα ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς ἑκάστης πλὴν*

36. *τρία δέ*: MS. at first *τρισι δε*, but corrected. 37. *τρία δʼ ὁσίων*: over these words the corrector has written *συρακοσιων*, a quite unintelligible correction, perhaps taken from a different MS., which had been thus corrupted. XLIV. 4. *κλεῖς*: so MS., not *κλῆς*, as 1st ed. and H-L.; *cf.* Meisterhans, p. 28. 5. *γράμματα*: K-W. and H-L. prefix *τά*, but perhaps *χρήματα καὶ γράμματα* are taken as one phrase. 7. *τοῦτον*: K-W. add *τʼ*.

36. *τρία μὲν κ.τ.λ.*: there is nothing in any other author to explain this passage, but it may be interpreted by comparison with the *μέχρι τριῶν ἑκατέρων* above. Apparently only three motions or proposals with reference to each of these subjects were allowed in each prytany.

XLIV. 1. *ἐπιστάτης*: Harpocration (*s.v.*) says, *δύο εἰσὶν οἱ καθιστάμενοι ἐπιστάται, ὁ μὲν ἐκ πρυτάνεων κληρούμενος, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῶν προέδρων, ὧν ἑκάτερος τίνα διοίκησιν διοικεῖ δεδήλωκεν ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ.* Suidas (*s. v. ἐπιστάτης*) and Eustathius (*in Odyss.* XVII. 455) give summaries of the present chapter, mostly in Aristotle's words, but without mentioning him. *Cf.* Rose, *Frag.* 397.

10. *προέδρους*: Harpocration (*s. v.*) refers to this passage, but misquotes its purport. He says, *ἐκληροῦντο τῶν πρυτάνεων καθʼ ἑκάστην πρυτανείαν, εἷς ἐξ ἑκάστης φυλῆς πλὴν τῆς πρυτανευούσης, οἵτινες τὰ περὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας διῴκουν. ἐκαλοῦντο δὲ πρόεδροι, ἐπειδήπερ προήδρευον τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων . . ὅτι δʼ ὁ καλούμενος ἐπιστάτης κληροῖ αὐτούς, εἴρηκεν Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ* (Rose, *Frag.* 398). His error is in stating that the proedri were elected for the prytany, whereas Aristotle

τῆς πρυτανευούσης, καὶ πάλιν ἐκ τούτων ἐπιστάτην

(who is correctly followed by Pollux and Photius) says that they were appointed afresh for each meeting of the Council or Ecclesia. The present passage confirms the now generally accepted view that the proedri were quite distinct from the prytanes, and that the author of the second argument to Demosthenes *contr. Androt.* is wrong in affirming that there was a second body of proedri, consisting of ten members of the πρυτανεύουσα φυλή, which executed the office of the prytanes for seven days. The existence of this second kind of proedri was accepted by Schömann and Meier in their earlier writings, but was given up subsequently by these writers; and it is now generally recognised that the unknown author of the document just referred to was wrong. There is no doubt that at one time the prytanes presided over the meetings of the Ecclesia. This is established by the speech of Nicias in Thuc. VI. 14, in which the Prytanis is expressly addressed as having the duty of putting a question to the vote in the Ecclesia, and by the case of the generals after Arginusae, when Socrates refused to put to the vote the proposal to try them collectively. In the latter case Socrates (or Plato for him) represents himself as a member of the πρυτανεύουσα φυλή (Plat. *Apol.* p. 32), and Xenophon (*Mem.* I. 1. 18) calls him ἐπιστάτης. Thucydides, Plato, and Xenophon are contemporary authorities, and their evidence is perfectly clear; and it must be taken as established that in the fifth century the prytanes presided over the meetings of the Ecclesia (and probably therefore of the Council too); but there is no sign of any division into sections of ten, nor is the title of proedri applied to them. When we pass to the fourth century the situation is changed. The proedri are repeatedly mentioned in the orators as the officials who put questions to the vote and otherwise acted as presidents, but it is now beyond question that they were not a section of the prytanes, but were the distinct body mentioned by Aristotle. *Cf.* Caillemer, *ap.* Daremberg and Saglio, *art.* Boulé. Whether the division of the fifty prytanes into sections of ten ever existed may be doubtful; but it may be taken for certain that they were never called proedri. In the fifth century the prytanes, under their ἐπιστάτης, presided at the Council and Ecclesia; in the fourth the proedri were instituted, appointed on each occasion from the other nine tribes, and the presidential duties were transferred to them and their ἐπιστάτης. Passages in which the prytanes are spoken of in connection with the business of the Ecclesia (Schömann, *De Com. Ath.*, 1819, 89, 90 F) are to be explained by observing that it was they that drew up the programme of business for each meeting, which they handed to the proedri for execution. A final proof that they did not themselves preside may be seen in the fact that the ἐπιστάτης of the prytanes, together with one-third of his colleagues, was forbidden to leave the Tholus during his day of office,

3 *ἕνα, καὶ παραδίδωσι τὸ πρόγραμμα αὐτοῖς· οἱ δὲ*
παραλαβόντες τῆς τ' εὐκοσμίας ἐπιμελοῦνται, καὶ
ὑπὲρ ὧν δεῖ χρηματίζειν προτιθέασιν, καὶ τὰς χειρο-
τονίας κρίνουσιν, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα διοικοῦσιν·
καὶ τοῦ τ' ἀφεῖναι κύριοί εἰσιν. καὶ ἐπιστατῆσαι
μὲν οὐκ ἔξεστιν πλέον ἢ ἅπαξ ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ,
προεδρεύειν δ' ἔξεστιν ἅπαξ ἐπὶ τῆς πρυτανείας
4 *ἑκάστης. ποιοῦσι δὲ καὶ ἀρχαιρεσίας στρατηγῶν*
καὶ ἱππάρχων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον
ἀρχῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, καθ' ὅ τι ἂν τῷ δήμῳ δοκῇ·
ποιοῦσι δ' οἱ μετὰ τὴν ϛ̄ πρυτανεύοντες ἐφ' ὧν ἂν

12. *πρόγραμμα*: *πρᾶγμα* Suidas, clearly a corruption. 14. *προτιθέασιν*: the corrector has added *δει και* above the line, apparently to be inserted before *προτιθέασιν*; but *δεῖ* has occurred already, and *καί* is incompatible with the construction, which the corrector must have misunderstood. K-W., however, insert *δεῖ* here instead of before *χρηματίζειν*. 15. *τά*: K-W. add *τ'*. 16. *τ'* should perhaps be struck out, with Blass and Richards; K-W. bracket it; H-L. substitute *τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*, after Rutherford. 17. *πλέον*: MS. *πλειον*. 19. *ἀρχαιρεσίας*: MS. *δεκαρχαιρεσιας*, but the word is unknown, and it is perhaps better, with Dr. Sandys, to consider the *δεκ* as a corrupt repetition of *δὲ καί*. 22. *μετὰ τήν*: MS. *μετα τα την*, by dittography.

and therefore could not have appeared in the Ecclesia. The prytanes had considerable administrative duties, notably the preparation of business to be submitted to the Ecclesia; but with the actual management of meetings they had, in the fourth century, nothing to do.

12. *πρόγραμμα*: the *πρόγραμμα* is of course the order of business which was to come before the Ecclesia.

22. *οἱ μετὰ τὴν ϛ̄ πρυτανεύοντες*: this statement as to the date of the election of the strategi is new. It has long been recognised that the author of the argument to Demosthenes *contr. Androt.* is wrong in saying that all elections took place in the last four days of the year (*cf.* Schömann, *De Com. Ath.* pp. 322–326); but nothing positive has been known on the subject. It has been conjectured (*e.g.* by Köhler, *Monatsber. d. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1866, p. 343) that the *ἀρχαιρεσία* took place in the ninth prytany; but the present passage shows that it was in the first prytany after the sixth in which the omens were favourable. The earliest date on which the elections could fall (the prytanies being presumably calculated from the 14th of Scirophorion, on which day, as appears from 32, l. 8, the new Council came into office) would consequently be in the month Gamelion. The fact that the date varied in different years may account for the other-

εὐσημία γένηται. δεῖ δὲ προβούλευμα γενέσθαι καὶ περὶ τούτων.

45. *Ἡ δὲ βουλὴ πρότερον μὲν ἦν κυρία καὶ χρήμασιν ζημιῶσαι καὶ δῆσαι καὶ ἀποκτεῖναι. καὶ Λυσίμαχον αὐτῆς ἀγαγούσης ὡς τὸν δήμιον καθήμενον ἤδη μέλλοντα ἀποθνήσκειν Εὐμηλίδης ὁ Ἀλωπεκῆθεν ἀφείλετο, οὐ φάσκων δεῖν ἄνευ δικαστηρίου γνώσεως οὐδένα τῶν πολιτῶν ἀποθνήσκειν· καὶ κρίσεως ἐν δικαστηρίῳ γενομένης ὁ μὲν Λυσίμαχος ἀπέφυγεν καὶ ἐπωνυμίαν ἔσχεν ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ τυπάνου, ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἀφείλετο τῆς βουλῆς τὸ θανατοῦν καὶ δεῖν καὶ χρήμασι ζημιοῦν, καὶ νόμον ἔθετο ἄν τινος ἀδικεῖν ἡ βουλὴ καταγνῷ ἢ ζημιώσῃ, τὰς καταγνώσεις καὶ τὰς ἐπιζημιώσεις εἰσάγειν τοὺς*

23. *γενέσθαι* : K-W. *γίνεσθαι*. XLV. 2. K-W. mark a lacuna after *ἀποκτεῖναι*. 4. *ἀποθνήσκειν* : MS. *αποθνησκειν*, and so l. 6. *Εὐμηλίδης* : MS. *ευμηλειδης*. 5. *Ἀλωπεκῆθεν* : MS. *αλωπεθηκεν*. 7. *δικαστηρίῳ* : K-W. prefix *τῷ*, though they allow the omission in 46, l. 13 and 55, l. 9. 12. *ἐπιζημιώσεις* : H-L. *ζημιώσεις*, after Wyse; but the fact that the compound is a *ἅπ. λεγ.* does not seem a sufficient ground for departing from the MS.

wise rather remarkable silence on the part of all ancient authorities on the subject. The date given in C. I. A. II. 416, on which Gilbert and Busolt rely, is now seen to refer only to the year in question (the exact date is doubtful). In that year the *ἀρχαιρεσίαι* were held *κατὰ τὴν μαντείαν* on the 20th day of the 10th prytany, in the month Munychion.

XLV. 1. *βουλή*: this summary jurisdiction of the Council in early times does not seem to be mentioned elsewhere, nor yet the story which Aristotle relates of its suppression. Unfortunately it is impossible to date this incident exactly, as neither of the persons mentioned, Lysimachus and Eumelides, is otherwise known. One person of the name of Lysimachus who might suit chronologically is the son of Aristides, who is mentioned by Plutarch (*Arist.* 27) and Demosthenes (*in Lept.* § 115, p. 491); another is the person who is mentioned in Xen. *Hell.* II. 4. 8 as a hipparch in the service of the Thirty. The latter may very probably be the person intended, as his share in the proceedings of the Thirty might easily bring him into trouble; but it was not an uncommon name, and we cannot be certain upon the subject.

θεσμοθέτας εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον, καὶ ὅ τι ἂν οἱ
2 *δικασταὶ ψηφίσωνται τοῦτο κύριον εἶναι. κρίνει δὲ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἡ βουλὴ τὰς πλείστας, μάλισθ' ὅσαι χρήματα διαχειρίζουσιν· οὐ κυρία δ' ἡ κρίσις, ἀλλ'* [Col. 24.] *ἐφέσιμος εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον. ἔξεστι δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἰδιώταις εἰσαγγέλλειν ἣν ἂν βούλωνται τῶν ἀρχῶν μὴ χρῆσθαι τοῖς νόμοις· ἔφεσις δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἐστὶν εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον ἐὰν αὐτῶν ἡ βουλὴ καταγνῷ.*
3 *δοκιμάζει δὲ καὶ τοὺς βουλευτὰς τοὺς τὸν ὕστερον ἐνιαυτὸν βουλεύσοντας καὶ τοὺς ἐννέα ἄρχοντας. καὶ πρότερον μὲν ἦν ἀποδοκιμάσαι κυρία, νῦν δὲ τούτοις ἔφεσίς ἐστιν εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον.*
4 *τούτων μὲν οὖν ἄκυρός ἐστιν ἡ βουλή. προβουλεύει δ' εἰς τὸν δῆμον, καὶ οὐκ ἔξεστιν οὐδὲν ἀπροβούλευτον οὐδ' ὅ τι ἂν μὴ προγράψωσιν οἱ πρυτάνεις ψηφίσασθαι τῷ δήμῳ· κατ' αὐτὰ γὰρ ταῦτα ἔνοχός ἐστιν ὁ νικήσας γραφῇ παρανόμων.*

46. *Ἐπιμελεῖται δὲ καὶ τῶν πεποιημένων τριήρων καὶ τῶν σκευῶν καὶ τῶν νεωσοίκων, καὶ ποιεῖται καινὰς τριήρεις ἢ τετρήρεις, ὁποτέρας ἂν ὁ δῆμος*

17. *ἐφέσιμος*: a letter appears to have been written and cancelled between the first ε and φ; it does not seem to be *ἔτ' ἐφέσιμος*, as H-L. read. 24. *τούτοις*: K-W. prefix *καί*. 28. *κατ' αὐτά*: *κατά*, H-L., after Kontos.
XLVI. 3. *καινάς*: MS. *καινας δε*: *καινας* has been at first miswritten, and is followed by a blot; probably the scribe made a blunder, and the corrector omitted to cancel the *δε*.

XLVI. 1. *τῶν πεποιημένων τριήρων*: the speech of Demosthenes against Androtion turns on the duty of the Council to superintend shipbuilding, and on the law, which Aristotle proceeds to mention, that unless this duty was fulfilled the Council was not to receive the customary donation (*δωρεά*) of a golden crown.

3. *ἢ τετρήρεις*: Mr. Cecil Torr has pointed out (*Athenaeum*, Feb. 7, 1891) that this statement gives a clue to the date of the composition of the treatise, as it must plainly have been written after the Athenians began to build quadriremes, and before they began to build quinque-

χειροτονήσῃ, καὶ σκεύη ταύταις καὶ νεωσοίκους. χειροτονεῖ δ' ἀρχιτέκτονας ὁ δῆμος ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς· ἂν δὲ μὴ παραδῶσιν ἐξειργασμένα ταῦτα τῇ νέᾳ βουλῇ, τὴν δωρεὰν οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῖς λαβεῖν. ἐπὶ [Col. 25.] *γὰρ τῆς ὕστερον βουλῆς λαμβάνουσιν. ποιεῖται δὲ τὰς τριήρεις, δέκα ἄνδρας ἐξ ἁ[πάντων] ἑλομένη τριηροποιούς. ἐξετάζει δὲ καὶ τὰ οἰκοδομήματα* 2 *τὰ δημόσια πάντα, κἄν τις ἀδικεῖν αὐτῇ δόξῃ τῷ τε δήμῳ τοῦτον [ἀπ]οφαίνει καὶ καταγνοῦσα παραδίδωσι δικαστηρίῳ.*

9. *ἁπάντων*: K-W. α[ὑτῶν], Wayte *ἑαυτῆς*. 12. *καταγνοῦσα*: K-W. *καταγνόντος*. 13. *δικαστηρίῳ*: H-L. prefix *τῷ*, after Gennadios and Naber, though they omit it in 45, l. 7, and 55, l. 9.

remes. The annual lists of the fleet are missing for some years before 330–329 B.C., but in that year (C. I. A. II. 807 b. 67–79) it includes eighteen quadriremes. The first quinqueremes (seven in number) appear in the list for 325–324 B.C. (C. I. A. II. 809 d. 62–92), which fixes an inferior date before which the treatise must have been written.

6. *παραδῶσιν*: the subject of this would naturally be taken to be *οἱ ἀρχιτέκτονες*, but in the light of the speech of Demosthenes it appears that it is really meant to apply to the Council.

8. *ποιεῖται δὲ κ.τ.λ.*: here begins the third roll of the papyrus, written in what has been described as the fourth hand. The first column of this section of the papyrus is headed *γ τόμος*. This division of the papyrus has been mentioned and explained in the Introduction.

10. *τριηροποιούς*: Pollux (I. 84) mentions the names of these functionaries, and Demosthenes (*contr. Androt.* § 17, p. 598) refers to the *ταμίας τῶν τριηροποιῶν*, and in such a way as to show that they were subordinate to the Council, *ἀκούω δ' αὐτὸν τοιοῦτον ἐρεῖν τινὰ ἐν ὑμῖν λόγον, ὡς οὐχ ἡ βουλὴ γέγονεν αἰτία τοῦ μὴ πεποιῆσθαι τὰς ναῦς, ἀλλ' ὁ τῶν τριηροποιῶν ταμίας ἀποδρὰς ᾤχετο ἔχων πένθ' ἡμιτάλαντα.* Aeschines (*contr. Ctes.* § 30, p. 58) appears to speak of them when he includes the officers whose duty it was *τριήρεις ναυπηγεῖσθαι* as among the magistrates *οὓς αἱ φυλαὶ καὶ αἱ τριττύες καὶ οἱ δῆμοι ἐξ ἑαυτῶν αἱροῦνται τὰ δημόσια χρήματα διαχειρίζειν*, but it is not clear how this is to be reconciled with Aristotle, unless it merely implies that the Council were obliged to choose one from each tribe, possibly from candidates nominated by the tribes. This view makes *ἁπάντων* preferable as a supplement in l. 9, in spite of the close subordination of this committee to the

47. Συνδιοικεῖ δὲ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀρχαῖς τὰ πλεῖστα. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ οἱ ταμίαι τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς εἰσὶ μὲν δέκα, κλ[ηροῦται] δ' εἷς ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς, ἐκ πεντακοσιομεδίμνων κατὰ τὸν Σόλωνος νόμ[ον—ἔτι γὰρ ὁ ν]όμος κύριός ἐστιν—, ἄρχει δ' ὁ λαχὼν κἂν πάνυ πένης ᾖ. παραλαμβάνου[σι δὲ τ]ό τε ἄγαλμα τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ τὰς νίκας καὶ τὸν ἄλλον κόσμον καὶ τὰ χρ[ήματ]α ἐναντίον τῆς βουλῆς.
2 ἔπειθ' οἱ πωληταὶ ι̅ μέν εἰσι, κληροῦται δ' εἷς ἐκ τῆς φ[υλῆς. μισ]θοῦσι δὲ τὰ μισθώματα πάντα καὶ τὰ μέταλλα πωλοῦσι, καὶ τὰ τέλη [μετὰ τ]οῦ ταμίου τῶν στρατιωτικῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικὸν ᾑρημένων ἐναντίον τῆς [βουλῆς] κατακυροῦσιν ὅτῳ ἂν ἡ βουλὴ χειρο-

XLVII. 3. εἷς ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς: Bury proposes to add ἑκάστης, Wyse to alter ἐκ τῆς into ἐξ ἑκάστης. The former is, of course, palaeographically easiest, but the phrase is perfectly intelligible without alteration, and recurs in l. 9.

Council evident from Demosthenes and from the present passage. Moreover kindred commissions such as the ἐπιστάται τῶν δημοσίων ἔργων and the ἀποστολεῖς were apparently elected ἐξ ἁπάντων (Gilbert, *Staatsalt.* I. 249, 250).

XLVII. 2. οἱ ταμίαι τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς: *cf.* note on ch. 30, l. 10.

4. κατὰ τὸν Σόλωνος νόμον: *cf.* ch. 8, l. 8.

5. ἄρχει δ' ὁ λαχὼν κἂν πάνυ πένης ᾖ: for a similar legal fiction compare ch. 7, l. 34.

6. παραλαμβάνουσι . . . βουλῆς: quoted by Harpocration *s.v.* ταμίαι, as from Aristotle's Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία (Rose, *Frag.* 402).

8. πωληταί: Harpocration refers to the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία as containing an account of these officials, but his own description is not verbally taken from this source (Rose, *Frag.* 401). The description of Pollux (VIII. 99) has some points in common, but not all.

11. τοῦ ταμίου τῶν στρατιωτικῶν: this officer is considered by Fraenkel (note on Boeckh's *Staatsh*[3]. I. 222) to have been first appointed in 347 B.C., after the fall of Olynthus. Another duty of the same officer is mentioned in the following chapter of the present treatise, viz. a share in the management of the games at the Panathenaic festival.

Παναθήναια. χειροτονοῦσι δὲ καὶ τὰς πρὸς τὸν
πόλεμον ἁπάσας. βουλὴ δὲ κληροῦται φ̄, ν̄ ἀπὸ 2
φυλῆς ἑκάστης. πρυτανεύει δ' ἐν μέρει τῶν φυλῶν
ἑκάστη καθ' ὅ τι ἂν λάχωσιν, αἱ μὲν πρῶται τέτ-
ταρες ἓξ καὶ λ̄ ἡμέρας ἑκάστη, αἱ δὲ ϛ̄ αἱ ὕστεραι
πέντε καὶ λ̄ ἡμέρας ἑκάστη· κατὰ σελήνην γὰρ
ἄγουσιν τὸν ἐνιαυτόν. οἱ δὲ πρυτανεύοντες αὐτῶν 3
πρῶτον μὲν συσσιτοῦσιν ἐν τῇ θόλῳ, λαμβάνοντες
ἀργύριον παρὰ τῆς πόλεως, ἔπειτα συνάγουσιν καὶ

14. *καί*: the reading is not clear, the letters visible more resembling *ει*, but *καί* is usually written in a very irregular manner in this hand. H-L. read *εἰς* (as 1st ed.) and cancel it.

The archons certainly did so; as appears, for instance, from Antiphon *De Choreut.* § 44, p. 146.

ἐκ Παναθηναίων εἰς Παναθήναια: this phrase, as appears from official inscriptions (C. I. A. I. 32, 117 ff., 273), indicates a four-year period, from one great Panathenaea to the next. This contradicts Boeckh's view that the officials *ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικόν* were annual, and if the date of one of these officials is indicated by reference to an archon (Aeschin. *contr. Ctes.* § 24, *Vit. X. Orat., Lycurg.* § 27), it no doubt refers to the year of his election, there being no other means of stating his date.

8. *πρυτανεύει κ.τ.λ.*: Harpocration (*s. v. πρυτανεία*), after stating the number of days in each prytany, adds, *διείλεκται δὲ περὶ τούτων Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ*. The scholiast to Plato's *Laws* (p. 459) appears to have drawn from this passage of Aristotle, and he uses almost the exact phrase, *κατὰ σελήνην γὰρ ἄγουσι τὸν ἐνιαυτόν*, which occurs below. *Cf.* Rose, *Frag.* 393.

9. *αἱ μὲν πρῶται κ.τ.λ.*: this statement as to the number of days in each prytany is repeated by Photius, but it is at variance with an inscription quoted by Clinton (*Fast. Hell.* II. 345) which contains an account of moneys expended in the archonship of Glaucippus (410 B.C.); for explicit mention is made there of a thirty-sixth day in the eighth, ninth, and tenth prytanies, which would show that at that date the last four prytanies, and not the first four, were the longest. The statement of Aristotle is, however, equally explicit, and it only remains to conclude that a change was made at some time between 410 B.C. and the middle of the following century, of which Aristotle is speaking.

14. *συνάγουσιν . . ἑκάστης*: Harpocration (*s. v. κυρία ἐκκλησία*) quotes this passage, naming the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* as his authority (Rose, *Frag.* 395). Pollux (VIII. 95, 96) gives a summary of the rest of the

τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον· τὴν μὲν οὖν βουλὴν ὅσαι
ἡμέραι, πλὴν ἐάν τις ἀφέσιμος ᾖ, τὸν δὲ δῆμον
τετράκις τῆς πρυτανείας ἑκάστης. καὶ ὅσ[α] δεῖ
χρηματίζειν τὴν βουλήν, καὶ ὅ τι ἐν ἑκάστῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ,
4 *καὶ ὅ τι οὐ καθήκει οὗτοι προγράφουσι. προγράφουσι*
δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας οὗτοι, μίαν μὲν κυρίαν, ἐν
ᾗ δεῖ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἐπιχειροτονεῖν εἰ δοκοῦσι καλῶς
ἄρχειν, καὶ περὶ σίτου καὶ περὶ φυλακῆς τῆς χώρας
χρηματίζειν, καὶ τὰς εἰσαγγελίας ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ
τοὺς βουλομένους ποιεῖσθαι, καὶ τὰς ἀπογραφὰς τῶν
δημευομένων ἀναγιγνώσκειν, καὶ τὰς λήξεις τῶν κλή-
ρων καὶ τῶν ἐπικλήρων ἀναγιγνώσκειν, [ὅπω]ς μηδένα
5 *λάθῃ μηδὲν ἔρημον γενόμενον. ἐπὶ [δὲ] τῆς ἕκτης*
πρυτανείας πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις καὶ περὶ τῆς ὀστρακο-

15. οὖν: om. Harp., H-L., K-W., but *cf. Poet.* 22, 1458ᵃ 25, and other instances of similar use of μὲν οὖν in *Index Aristotelicus*, p. 540ᵇ (cited by Newman). 16. ἐάν: MS. εαν. 18. χρηματίζειν: MS. χρηματιζει. 19. ὅ τι οὐ καθήκει: the 4th and 5th letters are doubtful; K-W. read καθειζει (= καθίζει) and restore ὅπου καθίζειν, and this is perhaps the best solution. 25, 26. ἀναγιγνώσκειν (*bis*): MS. αναγινωσκειν. K-W. bracket the repetition in l. 26. 28. εἰρημένοις: MS. ηρημενοις.

chapter and the beginning of the next, generally using Aristotle's words, though without naming him as his authority (*Frag.* 394).

15. ὅσαι ἡμέραι: this phrase, instead of the adverb ὁσημέραι, does not seem to occur before Themistius (L. and S.); but, as has been pointed out by Mr. J. B. Mayor, it facilitates the following τις, and it is retained by K-W. and H-L.

19. καθήκει: if the reading is correct, the meaning is 'what subjects are not suitable.'

προγράφουσι δὲ κ.τ.λ.: Harpocration, after the passage quoted just above (*cf.* note on l. 14) proceeds, προγράφουσι δέ, φησί, καὶ κυρίαν ἐκκλησίαν, ἐν ᾗ δεῖ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἀποχειροτονεῖν οἳ δοκοῦσι μὴ καλῶς ἄρχειν, καὶ περὶ φυλακῆς δὲ τῆς χώρας· καὶ τὰς εἰσαγγελίας ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοὺς βουλομένους ποιεῖσθαί φησι καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς, which is a slightly paraphrased version of the present passage (Rose, *Frag.* 395). The Lex. rhet. Cantabrig. also refers to Aristotle, *s. v.* κυρία ἐκκλησία, and quotes the greater part of this passage, including the mention of the ὀστρακοφορία below (Rose, *Frag.* 396), though not with verbal exactness.

φορίας ἐπιχειροτονίαν διδόασιν εἰ δοκεῖ ποιεῖν ἢ μή, καὶ συκοφαντῶν προβολὰς τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν μετοίκων μέχρι τριῶν ἑκατέρ[ων, κἄν τι]ς ὑποσχόμενός τι μὴ ποιήσῃ τῷ δήμῳ. ἑτέραν δὲ ταῖς ἱκετηρίαις, 6 *ἐν ᾗ θεὶς ὁ βουλόμενος ἱκετηρίαν ὧν ἂν βούληται* [Col. 23.] *καὶ ἰδίων καὶ δημοσίων διαλέξεται πρὸς τὸν δῆμον. αἱ δὲ δύο περὶ τῶν ἄλλων εἰσίν, ἐν αἷς κελεύουσιν οἱ*

29. *ἐπιχειροτονίαν*: so also the MS. of the Lex. rhet. Cantabrig., but the editors of the latter have unanimously altered it to *προχειροτονίαν*, whence K-W. introduce the latter reading here 'e lex. Cant.' The MS. of Aristotle confirms the MS. of the Lexicon, and illustrates the danger of conjectural emendation. 32. *τι μή*: the original scribe appears to have written *τιμαι* or *ειμαι*, which the corrector has altered to *τι μη* or *τιμηι*. In any case, however, the former must be the true reading. *ἑτέραν δέ*: H-L. *ἑτέρα δ' ἐστί*, but the space will not admit it, and the other reading seems traceable in the MS. 33. *ὁ*: MS. *ου*. *ὧν ἄν*: K-W. prefix *περί*, which the space will not admit of; H-L. *υ'*, i. e. *ὑπέρ*, which the space will admit, but there is no trace of writing on it. 34. *διαλέξεται*: MS. *διαδεξεται*, H-L. *διαλέγεται*.

30. *συκοφαντῶν προβολάς*: this form of procedure against *συκοφάνται* is mentioned by Aeschines (*De Fals. Leg.* § 153, p. 47), *τῶν συκοφαντῶν ὡς κακούργων δημοσίᾳ προβολὰς ποιούμεθα*, and Pollux (VIII. 46), *προβολαὶ δὲ ἦσαν καὶ αἱ τῆς συκοφαντίας γραφαί.* No mention, however, seems to be made anywhere of the limitation here described of the number of such complaints that could be heard at one sitting of the ecclesia. *Cf.* Schömann *De comitiis Atheniensium*, p. 232 *seq.*

31. *κἄν τις κ.τ.λ.*: this law is mentioned by Demosthenes (*in Lept.* § 100, p. 487), *ἔστι δὲ δήπου νόμος ὑμῖν, ἐάν τις ὑποσχόμενός τι τὸν δῆμον ἢ τὴν βουλὴν ἢ δικαστήριον ἐξαπατήσῃ, τὰ ἔσχατα πάσχειν*: *cf.* [Dem.] *in Timoth.* § 67, p. 1204, *νόμων ὄντων, ἐάν τις τὸν δῆμον ὑποσχόμενος ἐξαπατήσῃ, εἰσαγγελίαν εἶναι περὶ αὐτοῦ.*

33. *ὁ βουλόμενος*: the paraphrase of the present passage given by Pollux (VIII. 96) runs, *ἡ δὲ δευτέρα ἐκκλησία ἀνεῖται τοῖς βουλομένοις, ἱκετηρίαν θεμένοις, λέγειν ἀδεῶς περί τε τῶν ἰδίων καὶ τῶν δημοσίων.*

35. *αἱ δὲ δύο κ.τ.λ.*: according to Pollux (*l. c.*) the third ecclesia in each prytany was assigned to the hearing of heralds and embassies, and the fourth to *ἱερὰ καὶ ὅσια.* But this subdivision is not stated by Aristotle, and is inconsistent with the passage in Aesch. I. 23 (*in Timarch.* p. 4), *ἐπειδὰν τὸν καθάρσιον περιενεχθῇ καὶ ὁ κῆρυξ τὰς πατρίους εὐχὰς εὔξηται, προχειροτονεῖν κελεύει τοὺς προέδρους περὶ ἱερῶν τῶν πατρίων καὶ κήρυξι καὶ πρεσβείαις καὶ ὁσίων.*

νόμοι τρία μὲν ἱερῶν χρηματίζειν, τρία δὲ κήρυξιν καὶ πρεσβείαις, τρία δ' ὁσίων. χρηματίζουσιν δ' ἐνίοτε καὶ ἄνευ προχειροτονίας. προσέρχονται δὲ καὶ οἱ κήρυκες καὶ οἱ πρέσβεις τοῖς πρυτάνεσιν πρῶτον, καὶ οἱ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς φέροντες τούτοις ἀποδιδόασι.

44. Ἔστι δ' ἐπιστάτης τῶν πρυτάνεων εἷς ὁ λαχών· οὗτος δ' ἐπιστατεῖ νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν οὔτε πλείω χρόνον οὔτε δὶς τὸν αὐτὸν γενέσθαι. τηρεῖ δ' οὗτος τάς τε κλεῖς τὰς τῶν ἱερῶν ἐν οἷς τὰ χρήματ' ἐστὶν καὶ γράμματα τῇ πόλει, καὶ τὴν δημοσίαν σφραγῖδα, καὶ μένειν ἀναγκαῖον ἐν τῇ θόλῳ τοῦτόν ἐστιν καὶ τριττὺν τῶν πρυτάνεων ἣν
2 ἂν οὗτος κελεύῃ. καὶ ἐπειδὰν συναγάγωσιν οἱ πρυτάνεις τὴν βουλὴν ἢ τὸν δῆμον οὗτος κληροῖ προέδρους ἐννέα, ἕνα ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς ἑκάστης πλὴν

36. *τρία δέ*: MS. at first *τρισι δε*, but corrected. 37. *τρία δ' ὁσίων*: over these words the corrector has written *συρακοσιων*, a quite unintelligible correction, perhaps taken from a different MS., which had been thus corrupted. XLIV. 4. *κλεῖς*: so MS., not *κλῆς*, as 1st ed. and H-L.; *cf.* Meisterhans, p. 28. 5. *γράμματα*: K-W. and H-L. prefix *τά*, but perhaps *χρήματα καὶ γράμματα* are taken as one phrase. 7. *τοῦτον*: K-W. add *τ'*.

36. *τρία μὲν κ.τ.λ.*: there is nothing in any other author to explain this passage, but it may be interpreted by comparison with the *μέχρι τριῶν ἑκατέρων* above. Apparently only three motions or proposals with reference to each of these subjects were allowed in each prytany.

XLIV. 1. *ἐπιστάτης*: Harpocration (*s.v.*) says, *δύο εἰσὶν οἱ καθιστάμενοι ἐπιστάται, ὁ μὲν ἐκ πρυτάνεων κληρούμενος, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῶν προέδρων, ὧν ἑκάτερος τίνα διοίκησιν διοικεῖ δεδήλωκεν ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ.* Suidas (*s. v. ἐπιστάτης*) and Eustathius (*in Odyss.* XVII. 455) give summaries of the present chapter, mostly in Aristotle's words, but without mentioning him. *Cf.* Rose, *Frag.* 397.

10. *προέδρους*: Harpocration (*s. v.*) refers to this passage, but misquotes its purport. He says, *ἐκληροῦντο τῶν πρυτάνεων καθ' ἑκάστην πρυτανείαν, εἷς ἐξ ἑκάστης φυλῆς πλὴν τῆς πρυτανευούσης, οἵτινες τὰ περὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας διῴκουν· ἐκαλοῦντο δὲ πρόεδροι, ἐπειδήπερ προήδρευον τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων . . ὅτι δ' ὁ καλούμενος ἐπιστάτης κληροῖ αὐτούς, εἴρηκεν Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ* (Rose, *Frag.* 398). His error is in stating that the proedri were elected for the prytany, whereas Aristotle

τῆς πρυτανευούσης, καὶ πάλιν ἐκ τούτων ἐπιστάτην

(who is correctly followed by Pollux and Photius) says that they were appointed afresh for each meeting of the Council or Ecclesia. The present passage confirms the now generally accepted view that the proedri were quite distinct from the prytanes, and that the author of the second argument to Demosthenes *contr. Androt.* is wrong in affirming that there was a second body of proedri, consisting of ten members of the πρυτανεύουσα φυλή, which executed the office of the prytanes for seven days. The existence of this second kind of proedri was accepted by Schömann and Meier in their earlier writings, but was given up subsequently by these writers; and it is now generally recognised that the unknown author of the document just referred to was wrong. There is no doubt that at one time the prytanes presided over the meetings of the Ecclesia. This is established by the speech of Nicias in Thuc. VI. 14, in which the Prytanis is expressly addressed as having the duty of putting a question to the vote in the Ecclesia, and by the case of the generals after Arginusae, when Socrates refused to put to the vote the proposal to try them collectively. In the latter case Socrates (or Plato for him) represents himself as a member of the πρυτανεύουσα φυλή (Plat. *Apol.* p. 32), and Xenophon (*Mem.* I. 1. 18) calls him ἐπιστάτης. Thucydides, Plato, and Xenophon are contemporary authorities, and their evidence is perfectly clear; and it must be taken as established that in the fifth century the prytanes presided over the meetings of the Ecclesia (and probably therefore of the Council too); but there is no sign of any division into sections of ten, nor is the title of proedri applied to them. When we pass to the fourth century the situation is changed. The proedri are repeatedly mentioned in the orators as the officials who put questions to the vote and otherwise acted as presidents, but it is now beyond question that they were not a section of the prytanes, but were the distinct body mentioned by Aristotle. *Cf.* Caillemer, *ap.* Daremberg and Saglio, *art.* Boulé. Whether the division of the fifty prytanes into sections of ten ever existed may be doubtful; but it may be taken for certain that they were never called proedri. In the fifth century the prytanes, under their ἐπιστάτης, presided at the Council and Ecclesia; in the fourth the proedri were instituted, appointed on each occasion from the other nine tribes, and the presidential duties were transferred to them and their ἐπιστάτης. Passages in which the prytanes are spoken of in connection with the business of the Ecclesia (Schömann, *De Com. Ath.*, 1819, 89, 90 F) are to be explained by observing that it was they that drew up the programme of business for each meeting, which they handed to the proedri for execution. A final proof that they did not themselves preside may be seen in the fact that the ἐπιστάτης of the prytanes, together with one-third of his colleagues, was forbidden to leave the Tholus during his day of office,

3 ἕνα, καὶ παραδίδωσι τὸ πρόγραμμα αὐτοῖς· οἱ δὲ
παραλαβόντες τῆς τ' εὐκοσμίας ἐπιμελοῦνται, καὶ
ὑπὲρ ὧν δεῖ χρηματίζειν προτιθέασιν, καὶ τὰς χειρο-
τονίας κρίνουσιν, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα διοικοῦσιν·
καὶ τοῦ τ' ἀφεῖναι κύριοί εἰσιν. καὶ ἐπιστατῆσαι
μὲν οὐκ ἔξεστιν πλέον ἢ ἅπαξ ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ,
προεδρεύειν δ' ἔξεστιν ἅπαξ ἐπὶ τῆς πρυτανείας
4 ἑκάστης. ποιοῦσι δὲ καὶ ἀρχαιρεσίας στρατηγῶν
καὶ ἱππάρχων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον
ἀρχῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, καθ' ὅ τι ἂν τῷ δήμῳ δοκῇ·
ποιοῦσι δ' οἱ μετὰ τὴν ϛ̄ πρυτανεύοντες ἐφ' ὧν ἂν

12. πρόγραμμα: πρᾶγμα Suidas, clearly a corruption. 14. προτιθέασιν: the corrector has added δει και above the line, apparently to be inserted before προτιθέασιν; but δεῖ has occurred already, and καί is incompatible with the construction, which the corrector must have misunderstood. K-W., however, insert δεῖ here instead of before χρηματίζειν. 15. τά: K-W. add τ'. 16. τ' should perhaps be struck out, with Blass and Richards; K-W. bracket it; H-L. substitute τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, after Rutherford. 17. πλέον: MS. πλειον. 19. ἀρχαιρεσίας: MS. δεκαρχαιρεσιας, but the word is unknown, and it is perhaps better, with Dr. Sandys, to consider the δεκ as a corrupt repetition of δὲ καί. 22. μετὰ τήν: MS. μετα τα την, by dittography.

and therefore could not have appeared in the Ecclesia. The prytanes had considerable administrative duties, notably the preparation of business to be submitted to the Ecclesia; but with the actual management of meetings they had, in the fourth century, nothing to do.

12. *πρόγραμμα*: the *πρόγραμμα* is of course the order of business which was to come before the Ecclesia.

22. *οἱ μετὰ τὴν ϛ̄ πρυτανεύοντες*: this statement as to the date of the election of the strategi is new. It has long been recognised that the author of the argument to Demosthenes *contr. Androt.* is wrong in saying that all elections took place in the last four days of the year (*cf.* Schömann, *De Com. Ath.* pp. 322–326); but nothing positive has been known on the subject. It has been conjectured (*e.g.* by Köhler, *Monatsber. d. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1866, p. 343) that the *ἀρχαιρεσία* took place in the ninth prytany; but the present passage shows that it was in the first prytany after the sixth in which the omens were favourable. The earliest date on which the elections could fall (the prytanies being presumably calculated from the 14th of Scirophorion, on which day, as appears from 32, l. 8, the new Council came into office) would consequently be in the month Gamelion. The fact that the date varied in different years may account for the other-

ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀρχαῖς τὰ πλεῖσθ', ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν. τὰ μὲν οὖν ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς διοικούμενα ταῦτ' ἐστίν.

50. *Κληροῦνται δὲ καὶ ἱερῶν ἐπισκευασταὶ δέκα ἄνδρες, οἳ λαμβάνοντες τριάκοντα μνᾶς παρὰ τῶν ἀπο[δε]κτῶν ἐπισκευάζουσιν τὰ μάλιστα δεόμενα τῶν ἱερῶν, καὶ ἀστυνόμοι δέκα. τούτων δὲ ε̄ [μὲν]* 2 *ἄρχουσιν ἐν Πειραιεῖ, πέντε δ' ἐν ἄστει, καὶ τάς τε αὐλητρίδας καὶ τὰς ψαλτρίας [καὶ] τὰς κιθαριστρίας οὗτοι σκοποῦσιν ὅπως μὴ πλείονος ἢ δυεῖν δραχμαῖς μισθωθήσονται, κἂν πλείους τὴν αὐτὴν σπουδάσωσι λαβεῖν οὗτοι διακληροῦσι καὶ τῷ λαχόντι μισθοῦσιν. καὶ ὅπως τῶν κοπρολόγων μηδεὶς ἐντὸς ῑ σταδίων τοῦ τείχους· καταβαλεῖ κόπρον ἐπιμελοῦνται, καὶ τὰς ὁδοὺς κωλύουσι κατοικοδομεῖν καὶ δρυφάκτους ὑπὲρ τῶν ὁδῶν ὑπερτείνειν καὶ ὀχετοὺς μετεώρους εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν ἔκρουν ἔχον[τας] ποιεῖν καὶ τὰς θυρίδας εἰς*

L. 5. Πειραιεῖ: MS. πειραει. 7. δραχμαῖς: the last two letters have been blotted in writing, and are re-written above. H-L. δυοῖν δραχμαῖν, requiring a genitive, K-W. δυείν δραχμαῖν, but the form δυεῖν is only found with plurals, *cf.* Meisterhans, p. 162 (cited by Keil, p. 54); so the two words confirm one another. 10. ἐντὸς ῑ σταδίων: the syllable στα is written above the line, and the stroke above the numeral extends over the two adjoining letters. The correct reading is due to J. E. B. Mayor. 11. καταβαλεῖ: the MS. appears to have had καταβαλῃι at first and to have been corrected. ἐπιμελοῦνται: MS. επιμελονται, but the forms from ἐπιμελοῦμαι are elsewhere used in the MS.

L. 4. ἀστυνόμοι: Harpocration (*s. v.*), δέκα φησὶν εἶναι τοὺς ἀστυνόμους Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ, πέντε μὲν ἐν Πειραιεῖ, πέντε δ' ἐν ἄστει. τούτοις δέ φησι μελειν περί τε τῶν αὐλητρίδων καὶ ψαλτριῶν καὶ τῶν κοπρολόγων καὶ τῶν τοιούτων (Rose, *Frag.* 408).

11. καὶ τὰς ὁδοὺς κ.τ.λ.: one of the excerpts from Heraclides περὶ πολιτείας Ἀθηναίων runs καὶ τῶν ὁδῶν ἐπιμελοῦνται ὅπως μή τινες ἀνοικοδομῶσιν αὐτὰς ἢ δρυφάκτους ὑπερτείνωσιν (Rose, ed. 1886, *Frag.* 611).

14. τὰς θυρίδας εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν ἀνοίγειν: it is not certain whether θυρίς here means 'door' or 'window.' The latter is the common meaning of the word, but it is not clear what the object of the regulation would be. Windows in Greek houses might certainly overlook the street, and it is not in itself likely that there would be any objection to their opening outwards (since they were regularly in the upper story), while

τὴν ὁδὸν ἀνοίγειν· καὶ τοὺς ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς ἀπογιγνομένους ἀναιροῦσιν, ἔχοντες δημοσίους ὑπηρέτας.

51. *Κληροῦνται δὲ καὶ ἀγορανόμοι, πέντε μὲν εἰς Πειραιέα, ε̄ δ' εἰς ἄστυ. τούτοις δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν νόμων προστέτακται τῶν ὠ[νίω]ν ἐπιμελεῖσθαι πάντων ὅπως*
2 *καθαρὰ καὶ ἀκίβδηλα πωλῆται. κληροῦνται δὲ καὶ μετρονόμοι, πέντε μὲν εἰς ἄστυ, ε̄ δὲ εἰς Πειραιέα· καὶ*

it is certain that the question of doors so opening was a subject of consideration among the Greeks, and it is probable that *θυρίς* is here used in the latter sense. It has been commonly supposed that the doors of Greek houses habitually opened outwards, and this is supported by passages from Menander and his Latin imitators and from other Greek authors. That this was the belief of the ancients themselves is seen from Plutarch (*Poplic.* 20), where he says *τὰς δ' Ἑλληνικὰς πρότερον οὕτως ἔχειν* (*sc. ἐκτὸς ἀπάγεσθαι τὴν αὔλειον*) *ἁπάσας λέγουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν κωμῳδιῶν λαμβάνοντες, ὅτι κόπτουσι καὶ ψοφοῦσι τὰς αὑτῶν θύρας ἔνδοθεν οἱ προϊέναι μέλλοντες, ὅπως αἴσθησις ἔξω γένοιτο τοῖς παρερχομένοις ἢ προεστῶσι καὶ μὴ καταλαμβάνοιντο προϊούσαις ταῖς κλεισιάσιν εἰς τὸν στενωπόν.* There are also several passages in the grammarians in which *ψοφέω* is distinguished as being used for the knocking at the door by a person coming out, and *κρούω* or *κόπτω* for that of a person going in. Bekker however (*Charicles*, Excurs. to 3rd Chapter) argues that *ψοφέω* refers only to the noise made by a door in opening, which warned the actors standing outside that some one was entering from the house. That doors did in early times open outwards cannot be doubted: for, apart from the present passage of Aristotle, which shows that it was made the duty of a magistrate to stop the practice, there is also the fact quoted by the author of the *Economics* (II. 4) that Hippias the tyrant put a tax on doors which opened in that way. Whether that measure was continued after the expulsion of the Pisistratidae we do not know; but it seems certain that at some date previous to Aristotle the practice was forbidden. The interpretation of the passages in the comedians is another question, which cannot be fully argued here; but while it is certain that the ancients in subsequent times believed them to speak of a knocking on the part of persons going out, as a warning that the door was about to open, it seems improbable that the practice of opening outwards can really have existed in the times of Menander, in face of this statement of Aristotle, who was one of the generation preceding the comic writer.

LI. 1. *ἀγορανόμοι*: Harpocration (*s.v.*) refers to this treatise for the number of these officials (Rose, *Frag.* 409).

5. *μετρονόμοι*: the MSS. of Harpocration (*s.v.*) read *ἦσαν δὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν*

οὗτοι τῶν μέτρων καὶ τῶν σταθμῶν ἐπιμελοῦνται πάν-
των ὅπως οἱ πωλοῦντες χρήσωνται δικαίοις. ἦσαν δὲ 3
καὶ σιτοφύλακες κληρωτοί, πέντε μὲν εἰς Πειραιέα,
πέντε δ' εἰς ἄστυ, νῦν δ' εἴκοσι μὲν εἰς ἄστυ,
πεντεκαίδεκα δ' εἰς Πειραιέα. οὗτοι δ' ἐπιμελοῦνται
πρῶτον μὲν ὅπως ὁ ἐν ἀγορᾷ σῖτος ἀργὸς ὤνιος ἔσται

LI. 7. *χρήσωνται*: Blass, Rutherford, H-L., K-W. *χρήσονται*. 8. *κληρωτοί*: K-W. add *ι'*, which is very possible. 9. *εἴκοσι*: K-W. *εἰσὶ* $\overline{\text{ιε}}$, against MS. (which has *εικοσι*, not *εικος* as given in their textual note).

$\overline{\text{ιε}}$, *εἰς μὲν τὸν Πειραιᾶ ι', ε' δ' εἰς ἄστυ*, and as he proceeds shortly afterwards to refer to this treatise of Aristotle for the description of their duties, his account of their numbers might have been supposed to rest on the same authority. Boeckh (*Staatsh*[3]. I. 62, bk. I. 9) accepts the total fifteen, which he thinks is supported, as against the ten given by Photius and Lex. Seg. (p. 278), by its very uncommonness; but he reverses the sub-division, assigning ten to the city and five to the Piraeus, in which reading he is followed by Rose (*Frag*. 412). Dindorf, however, in his edition of Harpocration, corrects the text, reading *ἦσαν δὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν ι', ε' μὲν εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ, ε' δ' εἰς ἄστυ*. That this is the right reading is proved by the text of Aristotle; and, as Dindorf shows, the error could easily have arisen from the adjoining numerals *ι'* and *ε'* being combined, an additional number being supplied afterwards for the magistrates in Piraeus, in accordance with this total.

8. *σιτοφύλακες*: there is the same sort of confusion about the numbers here as in the case of the metronomi. The MSS. of Harpocration (*s. v.*), who refers to this treatise as his authority, read *ἦσαν δὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν* $\overline{\text{ιε}}$ *μὲν ἐν ἄστει, ε' δ' ἐν Πειραιεῖ*, where all that is necessary is to divide the number $\overline{\text{ιε}}$ into the two numbers *ι'* and *ε'*, which is done by Dindorf in his edition. Instead of this, Boeckh (*Staatsh*[3]. I. 105, bk. I. 15) and Rose (*Frag*. 411) retain the total $\overline{\text{ιε}}$ and insert *ι'* after it; in which they have the partial support of Photius, who has *ἦσαν δὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν πάλαι μὲν πεντεκαιδέκα ἐν ἄστει, ε' δ' ἐν Πειραιεῖ*, which they emend by inserting *ι'* before *ἐν ἄστει*. The text of Aristotle supports Dindorf's reading in Harpocration, and has analogy on its side. Photius may have been misled by Harpocration, and his authority is weakened by his subsequent statement, *ὕστερον δὲ λ' μὲν ἐν ἄστει, ε' δ' ἐν Πειραιεῖ*, where he has the total, thirty-five, correct, but the division wrong.

11. *ἀργός*: the reading is a little doubtful. The meaning would be 'unprepared corn,' in which sense the word is used by Hippocrates (*πυροὶ ἀργοί, Vet. Med.* 12). The position of the adjective is unnecessarily objected to by Mr. Bury. As Dr. Jackson has pointed out, a

δικαίως, ἔπειθ' ὅπως οἵ τε μυλωθροὶ πρὸς τὰς τιμὰς τῶν κριθῶν τὰ ἄλφιτα πωλήσουσιν καὶ οἱ ἀρτοπῶλαι πρὸς τὰς τιμὰς τῶν πυρῶν τοὺς ἄρτους, καὶ τὸν σταθμὸν ἄγοντας ὅσον ἂν οὗτοι τάξωσιν· ὁ γὰρ
4 *νόμος τούτους κελεύει τάττειν. ἐμπορίου δ' ἐπιμελητὰς δέκα κληροῦσιν· τούτοις δὲ προστέτακται τῶν τ' ἐμπορίων ἐπιμελεῖσθαι, καὶ τοῦ σίτου τοῦ καταπλέοντος εἰς τὸ σιτικὸν ἐμπόριον τὰ δύο μέρη τοὺς ἐμπόρους ἀναγκάζειν εἰς τὸ ἄστυ κομίζειν.*

52. Καθιστᾶσι *δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἕνδεκα κληρωτούς, ἐπιμελησομένους τῶν ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ, καὶ τοὺς ἀπαγομένους κλέπτας καὶ τοὺς ἀνδραποδιστὰς καὶ τοὺς λωποδύτας, ἂν μὲν [ὁμολογῶ]σι, θανάτῳ ζημιώ-*

LII. 2. *ἐπιμελησομένους*: H-L. prefix *τούς*. 3. *κλέπτας*: K-W². prefix ⟨*κακούργους τούς τε*⟩, from Etym. Mag.; but the passage there is only a paraphrase. 3, 4. *τοὺς . . τούς*: H-L. remove both articles. 4. *ζημιώσοντας*: MS. *ζημιωθησοντας*.

second epithet or part of a complex epithet may stand outside the article and substantive, *e.g. Eth. Nic.* VI. 4, 2, *ἡ μετὰ λόγου ἕξις πρακτικὴ ἕτερόν ἐστι τῆς μετὰ λόγου ποιητικῆς ἕξεως.*

16. *ἐμπορίου ἐπιμελητὰς ... κομίζειν*: Harpocration quotes this passage as from Aristotle, but with the variant *'Αττικόν* for *σιτικόν* (Rose, *Frag.* 410). The Lex. Seg. (p. 255) gives substantially the same words, but has *ἀστικόν* for *'Αττικόν*. *τὸ 'Αττικὸν ἐμπόριον* was a name for the Piraeus, and Mr. Torr prefers it, quoting Dem. pp. 917, 26; 918, 6; 932, 13. Dr. Sandys quotes Lex. Seg. 208, 284, 456 in support of *ἀστικόν*; but there is no sufficient reason for departing from the MS.

LII. 4. *ὁμολογῶσι*: the word is almost entirely lost in a flaw in the papyrus, but can be restored with certainty from the Lex. Seg. (p. 310, 14), *οἱ ἕνδεκα τοὺς κλέπτας καὶ τοὺς λωποδύτας καὶ ἀνδραποδιστὰς ὁμολογοῦντας μὲν ἀποκτιννύουσιν, ἀντιλέγοντας δὲ εἰσάγουσιν εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον*, and Pollux (VIII. 102), *οἱ ἕνδεκα . . . ἐπεμελοῦντο τῶν ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ καὶ ἀπῆγον κλέπτας ἀνδραποδιστὰς λωποδύτας, εἰ μὲν ὁμολογοῖεν θανατώσοντες, εἰ δὲ μὴ εἰσάξοντες εἰς τὰ δικαστήρια κἂν ἁλῶσιν ἀποκτενοῦντες.* Rose (in his last edition, 1886) gives these two passages as *Frag.* 429, though Aristotle is not referred to by name in them. The Athenian administration of law does not seem to have held out much inducement to criminals to confess. The same law is referred to by Aesch. *in Tim.*

σοντας, ἂν δ' ἀμφισβητῶσιν εἰσάξοντας εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον, κἂν μὲν ἀποφύγωσιν ἀφήσοντας, εἰ δὲ μὴ τότε θανατώσοντας, καὶ τὰ [ἀ]πογραφόμενα χωρία καὶ οἰκίας εἰσάξοντας εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον, καὶ τὰ δόξαντα δ[ημ]όσια εἶναι παραδώσοντας τοῖς πωληταῖς, καὶ τὰς ἐνδείξεις εἰσάξοντας· καὶ γὰρ ταύτας εἰσάγουσιν οἱ ἕνδεκα. εἰσάγουσι δὲ τῶν ἐνδείξεών τινας καὶ οἱ θεσμοθέται. κληροῦσι δὲ 2
καὶ εἰσαγωγέας ε̄ ἄνδρας, οἳ τὰς ἐμμήνους εἰσάγουσι δίκας, δυοῖν φυλαῖν [ἕ]καστος. εἰσὶ δ' ἔμμηνοι προικός, ἐάν τις ὀφείλων μὴ ἀποδῷ, κἄν τις ἐπὶ δραχ[μ]ῇ δανεισάμενος ἀποστερῇ, κἄν τις ἐν ἀγορᾷ βουλόμενος ἐργάζεσθαι δανείσηται παρά [τι]νος ἀφορμήν, ἔτι δ' αἰκείας καὶ ἐρανικαὶ καὶ κοινωνικαὶ καὶ ἀνδραπόδων καὶ ὑποζυγ[ίων] καὶ τριηραρχίας καὶ τραπεζιτικαί. οὗτοι μὲν οὖν ταύτας δικάζουσιν ἐμ- 3
μήνους εἰσάγ[ον]τες, οἱ δ' ἀποδέκται τοῖς τελώναις

5. *ἄν*: MS. *εν*. 15. *ἀποδῷ*: Blass, Kontos, H-L., K-W. *ἀποδιδῷ*. 16. *ἐπὶ δραχμῇ*: H-L. *ὑπὲρ δραχμήν*. *ἐν*: MS. *εαν*. 18. *ἐρανικαὶ . . . κοινωνικαί*: MS. *-κας . . -κας*, emended by Bury, H-L., K-W. The emendation seems necessary in the interests of grammar; the scribe (or the author) must have unconsciously made the words depend on a verb such as *εἰσάγουσι* or *δικάζουσι*. 19. *τριηραρχίας*: Bury, K-W. *τριηραρχικαί*. 20. *τραπεζιτικαί*: so Bury, H-L., K-W.; MS. *τραπεζιτικας*.

p. 16, § 113, *οἱ δὲ νόμοι κελεύουσι τῶν κλεπτῶν τοὺς μὲν ὁμολογοῦντας θανάτῳ ζημιοῦσθαι, τοὺς δ' ἀρνουμένους κρίνεσθαι*, and Dem. *in Timocr.* p. 721, § 65, *τῶν . . . κακούργων τοὺς ὁμολογοῦντας ἀνεὺ κρίσεως κολάζειν οἱ νόμοι κελεύουσιν*.

14. *ἔμμηνοι*: the list of the classes of cases included under this head (which had to be decided within a month of their commencement) is much longer than those elsewhere given. Pollux (VIII. 101), *s. v.* *ἐπαγωγεῖς*, says *ἦσαν δὲ προικός, ἐρανικαί, ἐμπορικαί*. Harpocration (*s. v.* *ἔμμηνοι δίκαι*) mentions only the last two of these. Boeckh argues that transactions relating to mines came under the same head, but Aristotle does not mention them as such (*cf.* Boeckh's treatise on the silver mines of Laurium, *Denkschr. d. Berl. Akad.* 1815, and *Staatsh.*[3] I. 64, bk. I. 9).

καὶ κατὰ τῶν τελωνῶν, τὰ μὲν μέχρι δέκα δραχμῶν ὄντες κύριοι, τὰ δ' ἄλλ' εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον εἰσάγοντες ἔμμηνα.

53. Κληροῦσι δὲ καὶ τετταράκοντα, τέτταρας ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς ἑκάστης, πρὸς οὓς τὰς ἄλλας δίκας λαγχάνουσιν· οἳ πρότερ[ον] μὲν ἦσαν τριάκοντα, καὶ κατὰ δήμους περιιόντες ἐδίκαζον, μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν τριάκοντα ὀλιγαρχία[ν] τετταράκοντα γεγόνασιν.
2 καὶ τὰ μὲν μέχρι δέκα δραχμῶν αὐτοτελεῖς εἰσὶ [Col. 27.] [κρίνει]ν, τὰ δ' ὑπὲρ τοῦτο τὸ τίμημα τοῖς διαιτηταῖς παραδιδόασιν. οἱ δὲ παραλαβόντες, [ἐ]ὰν μὴ δύνωνται διαλῦσαι, γιγνώσκουσι, κἂν μὲν ἀμφοτέροις ἀρέσκῃ τὰ γνωσθέντα [καὶ] ἐμμένωσιν, ἔχει τέλος ἡ

22. *δραχμῶν*: represented in the MS. by its symbol 〈. LIII. 1. *τετταράκοντα*: K-W. prefix *τούς*. 1, 2. *ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς ἑκάστης*: so at first MS., but *φυλῆς* became blotted out (apparently accidentally, from a blot in the line above) and is re-written after *ἑκάστης*. Hence 1st ed. *ἐξ ἑκάστης φυλῆς*, but the other order is almost universal in this treatise. 2. *ἄλλας*: Wyse *ἰδίας*. 4. *περιιόντες*: MS. *περιοντες*, which K-W². retain, comparing Hyperid. I. 13, 6, II. 2, 12, where the MS. has the same spelling.

LIII. 1. *τετταράκοντα*: the name of these magistrates, which Aristotle omits, was *κατὰ δήμους δικασταί*, as appears from Harpocration and Pollux. Harpocration (*s. v.*) says *περὶ τῶν κατὰ δήμους δικαστῶν, ὡς πρότερον μὲν ἦσαν λ' καὶ κατὰ δήμους περιιόντες ἐδίκαζον, εἶτα ἐγένοντο μ', εἴρηκεν Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ.* Pollux (VIII. 100) mentions the ten-drachma limit, *οἱ δὲ τετταράκοντα πρότερον μὲν ἦσαν τριάκοντα, οἱ περιιόντες κατὰ δήμους τὰ μέχρι δραχμῶν δέκα ἐδίκαζον, τὰ δὲ ὑπὲρ ταῦτα διαιτηταῖς παρεδίδοσαν· μετὰ δὲ τὴν τῶν τριάκοντα ὀλιγαρχίαν μίσει τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τοῦ τριάκοντα τετταράκοντα ἐγένοντο* (Rose, *Frag.* 413). They were instituted by Pisistratus, as is recorded in ch. 16, but apparently the office fell into disuse after the fall of the tyranny and was re-established in 453 B.C., as is stated in ch. 26.

2. *λαγχάνουσιν*: *λαγχάνειν δίκην* is the phrase applied to the suitor, who obtains leave to bring a suit before the proper magistrate. The subject therefore which must be supplied for *λαγχάνουσιν* here is some word meaning 'suitors.'

7. *τοῖς διαιτηταῖς*: *cf.* Harpocration (*s. v.*), who cites Aristotle (*λέγει δὲ περὶ αὐτῶν Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ*), and Pollux (VIII. 126). Rose, *Frag.* 414.

δίκῃ. ἂν δ' ὁ ἕτερος ἐφῇ τῶν ἀντιδίκων εἰς τὸ
δικαστήριον, ἐμβαλόντες τὰς μαρτυρίας καὶ τὰς
προκλήσεις καὶ τοὺς νόμους εἰς ἐχίνους, χωρὶς μὲν
τὰς τοῦ διώκοντος χωρὶς δὲ τὰς τοῦ φεύγοντος, καὶ
τούτους κατασημηνάμενοι καὶ τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ διαιτη-
τοῦ γεγραμμένην ἐν γραμματείῳ προσαρτήσαντες,
παραδιδόασι τοῖς δ̄ τοῖς τὴν φυλὴν τοῦ φεύγοντος
δικάζουσιν· οἱ δὲ παραλαβόντες εἰσάγουσιν εἰς τὸ 3
δικαστήριον, [τὰ μὲν ἐ]ντὸς χιλίων εἰς ἕνα καὶ
διακοσίους, τὰ δ' ὑπὲρ χιλίας εἰς ἕνα καὶ τετρα-
κοσίους. οὐκ ἔξεσ[τι δ' οὔ]τε νόμοις οὔτε προ-
κλήσεσι οὔτε μαρτυρίαις ἀλλ' ἢ ταῖς παρὰ τοῦ
διαιτητοῦ χρῆσθ[αι ταῖς εἰς] τοὺς ἐχίνους ἐμβεβλη-
μέναις. διαιτηταὶ δ' εἰσὶν οἷς ἂν ἑξηκοστὸν ἔτος 4
ᾖ. τοῦτο δὲ δῆλον [ἐ]κ τῶν ἀρχόντων καὶ τῶν
ἐπωνύμων. εἰσὶ γὰρ ἐπώνυμοι δέκα μὲν οἱ τῶν
φυλῶν, δύο δὲ καὶ τετταράκοντα οἱ τῶν ἡλικιῶν· οἱ δ'

17. *τοῖς δ̄*: so apparently MS., though it is far from certain; K-W. *πάλιν*, H-L. *εὐθύς*. *τὴν φυλήν*: so K-W., from 58, l. 9; so too H-L., who also think it to be the MS. reading, but the MS. has *τ(ῆs) φυλ(ῆs)*.

13. *ἐχίνους*: *cf.* Harpocration (*s. v.*), *ἔστι μὲν ἄγγος τι εἰς ὃ τὰ γραμματεῖα τὰ πρὸς τὰς δίκας ἐτίθεντο . . . . . μνημονεύει τοῦ ἄγγους τούτου καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης Δαναΐσιν* (Rose, *Frag.* 415). Photius mentions their special use for holding the evidence taken before an arbitrator when an appeal was made from him to the jury-courts.

17. *τοῖς . . . δικάζουσιν*: if the reading is right, these are presumably the magistrates described at the beginning of the chapter as *οἱ τετταράκοντα*. They are again mentioned in ch. 58, l. 9, again in connection with the *διαιτηταί*. They were evidently local magistrates of first instance, and acted as formal intermediaries between the *διαιτηταί* and the *δικαστήρια* at Athens.

27. *δύο δὲ καὶ τετταράκοντα οἱ τῶν ἡλικιῶν*: the subject of these *ἐπώνυμοι τῶν ἡλικιῶν* is obscure. Harpocration (*s. v. στρατεία ἐν τοῖς ἐπωνύμοις*) quotes the present passage, saying *τίς ἦν ἡ ἐν τοῖς ἐπωνύμοις στρατεία δεδήλωκεν Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ λέγων, "εἰσὶ γὰρ . . . . ἀναγράφονται·" καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα "χρῶνται δὲ τοῖς ἐπωνύμοις . . . στρατεύεσθαι"*

ἔφηβοι ἐγγραφόμενοι πρότερον μὲν εἰς λελευκωμένα γραμματεῖα ἐνεγράφοντο, καὶ ἐπεγράφοντο αὐτοῖς ὅ τ' ἄρχων ἐφ' οὗ ἐνεγράφησαν καὶ ὁ ἐπώνυμος ὁ

28. ἐγγραφόμενοι: MS. ενγραφομενοι. 30. ὁ (before ἐπώνυμος): om. Harpocration.

(ll. 44–47). He also says (*s. v.* ἐπώνυμοι), διττοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐπώνυμοι, οἱ μὲν ι´ τὸν ἀριθμόν, ἀφ' ὧν αἱ φυλαί, ἕτεροι δὲ β´ καὶ μ´, ἀφ' ὧν αἱ ἡλικίαι προσαγορεύονται τῶν πολιτῶν καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος ἀπὸ ιη ἐτῶν μέχρι ξ´ (Rose, *Frag.* 429). The Etym. Magn. says ἐπώνυμοι· διττοί εἰσιν οὗτοι, οἱ μὲν λεγόμενοι τῶν ἡλικιῶν, καί εἰσι δύο καὶ τεσσαράκοντα, οἳ καλοῦνται καὶ λήξεων ἐπώνυμοι· οἱ δὲ δέκα, ἀφ' ὧν αἱ φυλαὶ προσηγορεύθησαν, οἷον Ἐρεχθεύς, κ.τ.λ. Some writers (*e.g.* Smith's *Dict. Ant. s.v.* Eponymus; Schömann, *Antiquities of Greece*, Eng. Tr. p. 423) explain these forty-two eponymi to be the archons under whom the men liable for military service at any given time had enlisted. This, however, seems quite impossible, first from the way in which these forty-two are spoken of as parallel to the ten after whom the tribes were called, who were, of course, a fixed body, not merely a group of names which would never be the same for two years together. Further, it would be quite unnecessary to lay emphasis on the number forty-two. No doubt, as all persons were liable to military service from the ages of eighteen to sixty, the men on the roll at any given moment could be classified under the forty-two archons of the years in which they had respectively been placed on the roll; but for this it would not be necessary to say more than that each man's military service was reckoned from the archon under whom he had entered upon it. It seems rather that for the purposes of military service a cycle of forty-two years was arranged, to each of which a name was given, probably chosen, like those of the eponymi of the ten tribes, from the heroes of Athenian legendary history. Thus when a youth was enrolled in the lists of the tribes and became liable for military service, his name was entered on a roll, with the date of the year according to the archon and the name of the eponymous hero from whom his military service was to be dated. For all official purposes, such as the indication of what years were to be called out for service on any particular occasion, these names were employed; and this system had the advantage that it could be used for indicating dates in advance, to which the ordinary method of dating by the name of the archon was inapplicable. This cycle of forty-two years may be compared with the indiction-cycle of fifteen years in use under the Byzantine empire. Each able-bodied man had to serve through a complete round of these forty-two names; and on reaching the end of this cycle, *i.e.* when he attained the age of sixty, he then had to serve one year as a διαιτητής or arbitrator.

30. ὅ τ' ἄρχων ... καὶ ὁ ἐπώνυμος: this phrase alone is enough to show

τῷ προτέρῳ [ἔτει] δεδιαιτηκώς, νῦν δ' εἰς στήλην
χαλκῆν ἀναγράφονται, καὶ ἵσταται ἡ στήλη πρὸ τοῦ
βουλε[υτ]ηρίου περὶ τοὺς ἐπωνύμους. τὸν δὲ τελευ- 5
ταῖον τῶν ἐπωνύμων λαβόντες οἱ [τεττ]αράκοντα
διανέμουσιν αὐτοῖς τὰς διαίτας, καὶ ἐπικληροῦσιν
ἃς ἕκαστος διαιτήσει· καὶ ἀναγκαῖον ἃς ἂν ἕκαστος
λάχῃ διαίτας ἐκδιαιτᾶν. ὁ γὰρ νόμος, ἄν τις μὴ
γένηται διαιτητὴς τῆς ἡλικίας αὐτῷ καθηκούσης,
ἄτιμον εἶναι κελεύει, πλὴν ἐὰν τύχῃ ἀρχὴν ἄρχ[ω]ν
τ[ιν]ὰ ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἢ ἀποδημῶν. οὗτοι δ'
ἀτελεῖς εἰσὶ μόνοι. ἔστιν δὲ καὶ εἰσαγγέλλειν εἰς 6

31. *προτέρῳ*: K-W. *πρότερον*. *δεδιαιτηκώς*: Harpocration (most MSS.) *δεδεικτικῶς*, which Dindorf (after Aldus) corrects to *δεδιῃτηκώς*. Rose to *δεδιῳκηκώς*. Photius and Suidas *ἐπιδεδημηκώς*. 33. *περί*: it may be questioned whether *περί* (which is written in contracted form, *π'*) is not a scribe's error for *παρά* (*π`*); and so K-W., H-L. After these words the phrase *καὶ τὸν τελευταῖον* has been written and cancelled, *τὸν δὲ τελευταῖον* being then written instead. 37. *διαίτας*: bracketed by K-W. 40. *τινὰ ἐν*: so K-W., apparently rightly; 1st ed. [*ἄλλη*]*ν*, H-L. *τις ἐν*, after Burnet.

that the archon and the eponymus cannot be the same, *i.e.* that the eponymus is not here the same as the archon eponymus. Harpocration gives the same reading, with the exception that the article before *ἐπώνυμος* is absent; and Rose consequently transposes the words, reading *ὅ τε ἄρχων . . ὁ ἐπώνυμος καὶ ὁ κ.τ.λ.* Such an alteration is, however, clearly unauthorised.

31. *δεδιαιτηκώς*: in Demosthenes (pp. 542, 902) the perfect is *δεδιῃτηκέναι*, but the form given in the MS. is preserved here.

33. *περὶ τοὺς ἐπωνύμους*: *i.e.* near the statues of the ten eponymous heroes of the tribes; *cf.* note on ch. 3, l. 28, *ᾤκησαν κ.τ.λ.*

τὸν δὲ τελευταῖον κ.τ.λ.: *i.e.* each year the Forty take the list of those who are completing the last of their forty-two years of military service, and assign to them the duties as *διαιτηταί* which they are to undertake during the following year.

36. *καὶ ἀναγκαῖον κ.τ.λ.*: *cf.* Pollux (VIII. 126), *ἐπεκληροῦντο αὐτοῖς αἱ δίαιται, καὶ ἀτιμία ἀφώριστο τῷ μὴ διαιτήσαντι τὴν ἐπικληρωθεῖσαν δίαιταν.*

41. *εἰς τοὺς διαιτητάς*: *i.e.* an appeal could be made from the single *διαιτητής* to the combined board of *διαιτηταί*. That such an appeal existed had already been inferred by Fraenkel from Dem. *contr. Mid.* §§ 86, 87, p. 542. Harpocration (*s. v. εἰσαγγελία*) evidently draws from the present passage: *ἄλλη δ' εἰσαγγελία ἐστὶ κατὰ τῶν διαιτητῶν· εἰ γάρ*

τοὺς διαιτητὰς ἐάν τις ἀδικηθῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ διαιτητοῦ, κἂν τινος καταγνῶσιν ἀτιμοῦσθαι κελεύουσιν οἱ 7 νόμοι. ἔφεσις δ' ἐστὶ καὶ τούτοις. χρῶνται δὲ τοῖς ἐπωνύμοις καὶ πρὸς τὰς στρατείας, καὶ ὅταν ἡλικίαν ἐκπέμπωσι προγράφουσιν ἀπὸ τίνος ἄρχοντος καὶ ἐπων[ύμου μ]έχρι τίνων δεῖ στρατεύεσθαι.

54. Κληροῦσι δὲ καὶ τάσδε τὰς ἀρχάς· ὁδοποιοὺς πέντε, οἷς προστέτακται δημοσίους ἐργάτας ἔχουσι
2 τὰς ὁδοὺς ἐπισκευάζειν· καὶ λογιστὰς δέκα καὶ

42. *διαιτητάς*: Harp. *δικαστάς*, followed by 1st ed. and H-L., the latter thinking *τοὺς ἄλλους* would be required. The MS. reading is justified by Hardie and Gertz from Dem.; *cf.* note below. 46. *ἀπό*: so Harpocration; in the MS. the *α* is, by some confusion, followed by the sign which commonly stands for the termination *αι* of a verb, or, as H-L. say, the symbol for *δραχμή* (the two are practically identical in many cases). 47. *τίνων*: *τίνος* Harpocration.

τις ὑπὸ διαιτητοῦ ἀδικηθείη, ἐξῆν τοῦτον εἰσαγγέλλειν πρὸς τοὺς δικαστάς, καὶ ἁλοὺς ἠτιμοῦτο, where *δικαστάς* had already been conjecturally altered by Bergk to *διαιτητάς*.

LIV. 3. *λογιστὰς δέκα καὶ συνηγόρους*: Harpocration (*s. v.* *λογισταί*) says *ἀρχή τις παρ' Ἀθηναίοις οὕτω καλουμένη· εἰσὶ δὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν δέκα, οἳ τὰς εὐθύνας τῶν διῳκημένων ἐκλογίζονται ἐν ἡμέραις τριάκοντα ὅταν τὰς ἀρχὰς ἀποθῶνται οἱ ἄρχοντες. . . διείλεκται περὶ τούτων Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ, ἔνθα δείκνυται ὅτι διαφέρουσι τῶν εὐθύνων* (Rose, *Frag.* 406). These *λογισταί* are not the same as those mentioned in ch. 48, l. 16. The latter are members of the Council, who check the accounts of the magistrates during each prytany of their term of office. At the end of the term the *λογισταί* mentioned here and by Harpocration audit their whole accounts and bring them before the law-court; but even if this ordeal is safely passed, the magistrate is still liable to have complaint made before the *εὔθυνοι* (ch. 48, l. 18), which may entail a re-examination by the law-court. That there were two boards of *λογισταί* seems to be confirmed by Pollux VIII. 99, *δύο δὲ ἦσαν, ὁ μὲν τῆς βουλῆς, ὁ δὲ τῆς διοικήσεως, λογισταί*, where *two* must be a mistake for *two boards*.

The Lex. rhet. Cantabrig. p. 672, 20, *s. v.* *λογισταὶ καὶ συνήγοροι*, has a quotation professing to be from Aristotle, but differing wholly from the present passage; and as it is unlikely that Aristotle would have had two descriptions of the same officers in this one treatise, it is probable that the reference is incorrect. The passage runs thus, *Ἀριστοτέλης*

συνηγόρους τούτοις δέκα, πρὸς οὓς ἅπαντας ἀνάγκη τοὺς τὰς ἀρχὰς ἄρ[ξαντ]ας λόγον ἀπενεγκεῖν. οὗτοι γάρ εἰσι μόνοι ⟨οἱ⟩ τοῖς ὑπευθύνοις λογιζόμενοι καὶ τὰς εὐθύνας εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον εἰσάγοντες. κἂν μέν τινα κλέπτοντ' ἐξελέγξωσι, κλοπὴν οἱ δικασταὶ καταγιγνώσκουσι καὶ τὸ γνωσθὲν ἀποτίνεται δεκαπλοῦν· ἐὰν δέ τινα δῶρα λαβόντα ἐπιδείξωσιν καὶ καταγνῶσιν οἱ δικασταί, δώρων τιμῶσιν, ἀποτίνεται δὲ καὶ τοῦτο δεκαπλοῦν· ἂν δ' ἀδικεῖν καταγνῶσιν, ἀδικίου τιμῶσιν, ἀποτίνεται δὲ τοῦθ' ἁπλοῦν ἐὰν

LIV. 6. *οἱ* : added by J. B. Mayor, H-L., K-W. 9. *καταγιγνώσκουσι* : MS. at first *καταγινωισκουσι*, but the superflous *ι* is cancelled by a dot above it. *γνωσθέν* : K-W. *καταγνωσθέν*. 10. *ἐπιδείξωσιν* : K-W. *ἀποδείξωσιν*, against MS.

ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ οὕτως λέγει· λογισταὶ δὲ αἱροῦνται δέκα, παρ' οἷς διαλογίζονται πᾶσαι αἱ ἀρχαὶ τά τε λήμματα καὶ τὰς γεγενημένας δαπάνας· καὶ ἄλλοι δέκα συνήγοροι οἵτινες συνανακρίνουσι τούτοις. καὶ οἱ τὰς εὐθύνας διδόντες παρὰ τούτοις ἀνακρίνονται πρῶτον, εἶτα ἐφίενται εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον, εἰς ἕνα καὶ φ' (Rose, *Frag.* 407).

13. *ἀδικίου* : this class of actions is not mentioned in the extant orators (Dindorf ad Harp. *s. v.*), but Harpocration mentions it and quotes the present passage almost verbally, though without referring to Aristotle by name. His words are, *ἐστὶ δὲ ὄνομα δίκης. ἀποτίνυται δὲ τοῦτο ἁπλοῦν, ἐὰν πρὸ τῆς θ' πρυτανείας ἀποδοθῇ· εἰ δὲ μή, διπλοῦν καταβάλλεται.* Plutarch (*Pericl.* 32) mentions it in reference to the charge brought against Pericles regarding his expenditure of the public money, *Ἅγνων δὲ τοῦτο μὲν ἀφεῖλε τοῦ ψηφίσματος, κρίνεσθαι δὲ τὴν δίκην ἔγραψεν ἐν δικασταῖς χιλίοις καὶ πεντακοσίοις, εἴτε κλοπῆς καὶ δώρων εἴτ' ἀδικίου βούλοιτό τις ὀνομάζειν τὴν δίωξιν.* It may be suggested, in passing, that in the latter passage the number 1500 is a mistake for 501. The numeral for 1 (*α'*) is easily confounded with that for 1000 (*͵α* or *ᾶ*), and we have several instances of courts composed of a round number of hundreds with one additional member, which show that it was the usual practice. Courts of 201 and 401 are mentioned in ch. 53, and 501 is given as the size of the court for trying this particular class of cases in the extract from the Lex. rhet. Cantabrig. quoted just above. It is evident that Hagnon proposed that Pericles should be tried by the regular court, in place of the unusual procedure proposed by Dracontides.

[πρὸ τῆς] θ̄ πρυτανείας ἐκτείσῃ τις, εἰ δὲ μή, διπλοῦ-
3 ται· τὸ ⟨δὲ⟩ δεκαπλοῦν οὐ διπλοῦται. κληροῦσι
δὲ καὶ γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν καλούμενον,
ὃς τῶν γραμμάτων ἐστὶ κύριος καὶ τὰ [ψη]φίσματα
τὰ γιγνόμενα φυλάττει, καὶ τἆλλα πάντα ἀντιγρά-
φεται καὶ παρακάθηται τῇ βουλῇ. πρότερον μὲν
οὖν οὗτος ἦν χειροτονητός, καὶ τοὺς ἐνδοξοτάτους
καὶ πιστοτάτους ἐχ[ειρ]οτόνουν· καὶ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς
στήλαις πρὸς ταῖς συμμαχίαις καὶ προξενί[αι]ς καὶ
πολιτείαις οὗτος ἀναγράφεται· νῦν δὲ γέγονε κλη-
4 ρωτός. κληροῦσι δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους ἕτερον ὃς

14. ἐκτείσῃ : MS. εκτισηι, *cf.* Meisterhans, p. 41. 15. δέ : om. MS., through confusion with the first letters of δεκαπλοῦν. 17. γραμμάτων : MS. γραμματεων, but it is perhaps better to alter the text in accordance with Harpocration and Pollux; so Burnet, Bywater, Blass, Naber, K-W., H-L. 18. γιγνόμενα : MS. γινομενα. 21. πιστοτάτους : MS. apparently απιστοτατους, probably owing to some confusion between καιπιστοτατους and κ'απιστοτατους. 24. ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους ἕτερον : MS. apparently επι τουτοις ν[ο]μον ετερον, which is of course a scribe's blunder; the true reading is recoverable from the passage of Pollux quoted in the note on l. 16.

16. γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν καλούμενον : Harpocration (*s. v.* γραμματεύς) quotes this passage, from τῶν γραμμάτων to βουλῇ. Pollux (VIII. 98) mentions both this γραμματεύς and the others whom Aristotle describes below, γραμματεὺς ὁ κατὰ πρυτανείαν κληρωθεὶς ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς ἐπὶ τῷ τὰ γράμματα φυλάττειν καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα· καὶ ἕτερος ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς χειροτονούμενος. ὁ δ' ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου αἱρεθεὶς γραμματεὺς ἀναγινώσκει τῷ τε δήμῳ καὶ τῇ βουλῇ (Rose, *Frag.* 399).

23. πολιτείαις : the meaning, as has been pointed out by Prof. Campbell and others, no doubt is 'decrees for conferring citizenship.'

24. ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους ἕτερον : this official is no doubt the same as the second of those named by Pollux; but it is a question whether he is not also the same as the ἀντιγραφεύς mentioned by Pollux and Harpocration. Pollux (*l.c.*) says ἀντιγραφεὺς πρότερον μὲν αἱρετός, αὖθις δὲ κληρωτὸς ἦν καὶ πάντα ἀντεγράφετο παρακαθήμενος τῇ βουλῇ. The latter words correspond exactly with Aristotle's description, and it seems probable that Pollux has described the same official twice over. Harpocration quotes Aristotle as speaking of the ἀντιγραφεὺς τῆς βουλῆς in this treatise, and the use of the word ἀντιγράφεται makes it practically certain that this is the passage referred to. Aristotle, however, appears not to have given him that title, but to have spoken of him merely as ἕτερος γραμματεὺς ὃς . . . ἀντιγράφεται.

παρακάθηται τῇ βουλῇ, καὶ ἀντιγράφεται καὶ οὗτος
πάντας. χειροτονεῖ δὲ καὶ ὁ δῆμος γραμματέα τὸν ἀνα- 5
γνωσόμενον αὐτῷ καὶ τῇ βουλῇ, καὶ οὗτος οὐδενός
ἐστι κύ[ρι]ος ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἀναγνῶναι. κληροῖ δὲ καὶ 6
ἱεροποιοὺς δέκα, τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ ἐκθύματα καλουμένους,
[οἳ] τά τε [μαν]τευτὰ ἱερὰ θύουσιν, κἄν τι καλλιερῆ-
σαι δέῃ καλλιεροῦσι μετὰ τῶν μάντε[ων]. κληροῖ 7
δὲ καὶ ἑτέρους δέκα, τοὺς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν καλουμένους,
οἳ θυσίας τέ τινας θύουσι. [καὶ τ]ὰς πεντετηρίδας
ἁπάσας διοικοῦσιν πλὴν Παναθηναίων. ε[ἰσὶ δὲ]
πεντετηρίδες, μία [μὲν ἡ εἰ]ς Δῆλον (ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἐπ-

28. *ἀλλά*: Blass, Richards, Gennadios, H-L., K-W. alter to *ἀλλ' ἤ*; but Aristotle sometimes uses *ἀλλά* in this sense. The *Index Aristotelicus* quotes *Eth. N.* X. 5, p. 1176ᵃ 22, VIII. 13, p. 1152ᵇ 30, *Rhet.* II. 24, p. 1402ᵃ 27. 34. *εἰσὶ δέ*: H-L. ε̄ [*δ' εἰσί*]; the *ε* is probably right, but there is no line above it to mark it as a numeral (the appearance of a line in the facsimile is due to a crack in the papyrus). The end of a mark of abbreviation is visible before *πεντετηρίδες*. 35. K-W. insert *δ'* after *πεντετηρίδες*.

26. *πάντας*: *sc.* *νόμους*, which confirms the emendation *ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους* at the beginning of the sentence.

γραμματέα κ.τ.λ.: cited almost verbally (without mentioning Aristotle) in Lex. Seg. p. 226, as Dr. Sandys has pointed out.

29. *ἱεροποιούς*: the Etym. Magn. quotes this description, as far as *πλὴν Παναθηναίων*, almost verbally, and refers to this treatise as its authority, but it makes no mention of the two different boards of ten of which Aristotle speaks, combining the functions of both under one head (Rose, *Frag.* 404).

30. *τά τε μαντευτὰ ἱερὰ θύουσιν*: the E. M. reads *τά τε μαντεύματα ἱεροθετοῦσι* (one MS. *ἱεροθύτουσι*), but the reading of the MS. here is confirmed by the Lex. Demosth. Patm. (p. 11, ed. Sakk.) which has *οἳ τὰ μεμαντευμένα ἱερὰ θύουσιν*.

35. *πεντετηρίδες*: Pollux (VIII. 107) also enumerates these festivals in connection with the *ἱεροποιοί*, whom he describes thus, *δέκα ὄντες οὗτοι ἔθυον θυσίας τὰς ⟨νομιζομένας καὶ⟩ πεντετηρίδας ⟨διοικοῦσι⟩, τὴν εἰς Δῆλον, τὴν ἐν Βραυρῶνι, τὴν τῶν Ἡρακλείων* (MSS. *Ἡρακλειδῶν*), *τὴν Ἐλευσῖνι* (MSS. *Ἐλευσῖνα* or *Ἐλευσίναδε*). The corrections (indicated by the brackets) made by Rose are justified by the text of Aristotle, though it would be preferable to insert *τάς* before *πεντετηρίδας*, which would help to explain the omission of the phrase in

[τε]τηρὶς ἐνταῦθα), δευτέρα δὲ Βραυρώνια, τρίτη [δὲ Ἡράκλει]α, τετάρτη δὲ Ἐλευ[σίνι]α, [ε̄] δὲ Π[αν]αθήναια· καὶ τούτων οὐδεμία ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἐγγί[γνεται].

37. Ἐλευσίνια, ε̄ δέ: the supplements are suggested by Wyse. The abbreviation of the ordinal is paralleled in 47, l. 35. The mark of a numeral is visible above the lacuna. 37, 38. K-W. Ἐλευ[σίνια. τ]ὰ δὲ Παναθήναια τούτων οὐδεμιᾷ. H-L. οὐδὲ τρία (as MS. reading for οὐδεμία), but apparently wrongly. There seems, however, to be something between ουδε and μα. 38. ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἐγγί[γνεται]: the reading is rather doubtful. MS. at first εν τωι αυτωι γινεται, apparently, but above the beginning of the last word an addition has been made in the same hand, which seems to be εν. Blass ἐνιαυτῷ γίνεται for ἐγγίνεται, and so K-W., H-L.; *cf.* note below.

the archetypal MS., and to read διῴκουν for διοικοῦσι. Of the four festivals mentioned, that at Delos (called εἰς Δῆλον from its involving a θεωρία from Athens to the island) is the one of which the re-establishment is recorded by Thucydides (III. 104). Delos being subject to Athens, the Athenians took over the management of the ancient Delian festival. The festival of Artemis at Brauron is mentioned by Herodotus (VI. 138), and was the occasion of the curious ceremony in which the Athenian girls imitated bears and were denominated ἄρκτοι. Of the Heracleia little is known. Harpocration (*s.v.*) refers to Demosthenes (*De Fals. Leg.* §§ 86, 125, pp. 368, 379), and adds πολλῶν ὄντων τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀττικὴν Ἡρακλείων, νῦν ἂν ὁ Δημοσθένης μνημονεύοι ἤτοι τῶν ἐν Μαραθῶνι ἢ τῶν ἐν Κυνοσάργει· ταῦτα γὰρ μάλιστα διὰ τιμῆς εἶχον Ἀθηναῖοι. That it was a festival held ordinarily outside Athens is clear from the passages in Demosthenes, in which the fact of its being held within the walls is mentioned as a sign of the alarm caused by the fear of invasion. The festival at Eleusis, of which the existence has barely been known hitherto (A. Mommsen, *Heortologie*, p. 243, regards it with much suspicion), is mentioned in an inscription (cited by Wyse from Ἐφημ. Ἀρχ. 1883, p. 123, β. 46–49). This inscription is actually of the year of Cephisophon, and slightly supports the idea that new regulations affecting the πεντετηρίδες were made in that year; but it affords no clue for supplying the mutilated words in ll. 38, 39.

38. ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἐγγίγνεται: if this reading is correct, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ presumably means 'in the same place.' It might conceivably be taken to mean 'in the same year,' and this is the sense given by the restoration adopted by Blass, K-W., and H-L.; but this is questionable as a matter of fact. The Delian festival, according to the date given by Thucydides (*l. c.*), was re-established in the third year of an Olympiad, which is also the year of the great Panathenaea; but Schoeffer (*de Deli insulae rebus*, pp. 59, 60) shows reason to suppose that the date was at some later period altered to the second year.

. . . . . δὲ πρόκειται . . . . αις . . . . ἐπὶ Κηφισοφῶντος
ἄρχοντος. κληροῦσι δὲ καὶ εἰς Σαλαμῖνα ἄρχοντα, 8
καὶ εἰς Πει[ραι]έα δήμ[αρχ]ον, οἳ τά τε Διονύσια ποι-
οῦσι ἑκατέρωθι καὶ χορηγοὺς καθιστᾶσιν· ἐν Σαλα-
[μῖνι] δὲ καὶ τὸ [ὄν]ομα τοῦ ἄρχοντος ἀναγράφεται.

55. Αὗται μὲν οὖν αἱ ἀρχαὶ κληρωταί τε καὶ κύριαι τῶν [εἰρη]μένων [πραγμάτ]ων εἰσίν. οἱ δὲ καλούμενοι ἐννέα ἄρχοντες, τὸ μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὃν τρόπον καθίσταντο [εἴρ]ηται [ἤδη· νῦν] δὲ κληροῦσιν θεσμοθέτας μὲν ἓξ καὶ γραμματέα τούτοις, ἔτι δ' ἄρχοντα καὶ βασι[λέα] καὶ πολέμαρχον, κατὰ μέρος

39. πρόκειται: there is some confusion over this word in the MS. Apparently some other letter or mark of abbreviation originally followed π, and the letters ρο have been inserted afterwards, half above the line. H-L. [νόμος δὲ] πρόκειται [περὶ τούτων τέθεις], but this does not suit the remains in the MS.

The Heracleia, however, appears from the passages in Demosthenes also to have fallen in the third year of the Olympiad, in the month Hecatombaeon. The date of the Brauronia is unknown.

39. ἐπὶ Κηφισοφῶντος ἄρχοντος: *i.e.* 329 B.C. The sentence is hopelessly mutilated, partly through a lacuna in the papyrus, partly through the writing having been obliterated in the middle of the column, where the papyrus was folded. The letter before αις appears to be φ, or possibly ρ; if it is the former, the word is probably γραφαῖς, and the sentence may have stood, τοῦτο δὲ προκεῖται γραφαῖς ταῖς ἐπὶ Κ. ἄρχοντος, the meaning being that public regulations were made concerning those festivals at the date mentioned. But it is impossible to restore the passage with certainty. The note of time is, however, useful, as showing that the Πολιτεῖαι was composed (or at any rate revised, as this is clearly an incidental note which might have been added after the main bulk of the work was written) in the last seven years of Aristotle's life.

LV. 4. εἴρηται ἤδη: see chapters 3, 8, 22, 26.

5. θεσμοθέτας . . . ἐξ ἑκάστης φυλῆς: Schömann (*Ant. of Greece*, Eng. Tr. p. 410), following Sauppe (*De creatione archontum*), suggests that the nine archons were chosen from nine of the tribes selected by lot, the tenth electing none. The present passage shows that the tenth was compensated by having the election of the Secretary to the archons.

2 ἐξ ἑκάστης φυλῆς. δοκιμάζονται δ' οὗτοι πρῶτον μὲν ἐν τῇ [βουλῇ] τοῖς φ̄, πλὴν τοῦ γραμματέως, οὗτος δ' ἐν δικαστηρίῳ μόνον ὥσπερ οἱ ἄλλοι ἄρχον[τες] (π[άντες γὰρ καὶ] οἱ κληρωτοὶ καὶ οἱ χειροτονητοὶ δοκιμασθέντες ἄρχουσιν), οἱ δ' ἐννέα [ἄρχ]οντες [ἔν] τε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ πάλιν ἐν δικαστηρίῳ. καὶ πρότερον μὲν οὐκ ἦρχεν ὅντ[ιν' ἀ]ποδοκιμάσειεν ἡ βουλή, νῦν δ' ἔφεσίς ἐστιν εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον, καὶ
3 τοῦτο κύριόν ἐστι τῆς δοκι[μα]σίας. ἐ[πε]ρωτῶσιν δ' ὅταν δοκιμάζωσιν, πρῶτον μὲν τίς σοι πατὴρ καὶ πόθεν [Col. 28.]
τῶν δήμων, καὶ τίς πατρὸς πατήρ, καὶ τίς μήτηρ, καὶ τίς μητρὸς πατὴρ καὶ πόθεν τῶν δήμων· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα εἰ ἔστιν αὐτῷ Ἀπόλλων πατρῷος καὶ Ζεὺς ἑρκεῖος, καὶ ποῦ [τ]αῦτα τὰ ἱερά ἐστιν, εἶτα ἠρία εἰ ἔστιν καὶ ποῦ ταῦτα, ἔπειτα γονέας εἰ εὖ ποιεῖ [καὶ] τὰ τέλη τελεῖ, καὶ τὰς στρατείας εἰ ἐστράτευται. ταῦτα δ'

9. *δικαστηρίῳ*: H-L. prefix *τῷ*, but *cf.* 45, l. 7, 46, l. 13. 17. *πατρὸς πατήρ*: MS. *πατηρ πατρος*, but a dot and a line placed above each of the words indicate that they are to be transposed. 22. *τελεῖ*: K-W. prefix *εἰ*.

7. *πρῶτον μὲν κ.τ.λ.*: a summary of the passage which follows is given by Pollux (VIII. 85, 86), *ἐκαλεῖτο δέ τις θεσμοθετῶν ἀνάκρισις, εἰ Ἀθηναῖοί εἰσιν ἑκατέρωθεν ἐκ τριγονίας καὶ τὸν δῆμον* (qu. *τῶν δήμων*?) *πόθεν καὶ εἰ Ἀπόλλων ἔστιν αὐτοῖς πατρῷος καὶ Ζεὺς ἕρκειος καὶ εἰ τοὺς γονέας εὖ ποιοῦσι καὶ εἰ ἐστράτευνται ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος καὶ εἰ τὸ τίμημα ἔστιν αὐτοῖς* (Rose, *Frag.* 374). There is a similar passage in the Lex. rhet. Cantabrig. (p. 670, 14), in which Aristotle is referred to by name (Rose, *Frag.* 375).

20. *ἠρία*: *cf.* Dem. *in Eubul.* § 67, p. 1319, *οἰκεῖοί τινες εἶναι μαρτυροῦσιν αὐτῷ; πανύ γε, πρῶτον μέν γε τέτταρες ἀνεψιοί, εἶτ' ἀνεψιαδοῦς, εἶθ' οἱ τὰς ἀνεψίας λαβόντες αὐτῷ, εἶτα φράτερες, εἶτ' Ἀπόλλωνος πατρῴου καὶ Διὸς ἑρκείου γεννῆται, εἶθ' οἷς ἠρία ταὐτά, εἶθ' οἱ δημόται κ.τ.λ.* The present passage confirms the emendation *ἠρία* for *ἱερά* in Dinarch. *contr. Arist.* § 18, p. 107, *ἀνακρίναντες τοὺς τῶν κοινῶν τι μέλλοντας διοικεῖν, τίς ἔσται τὸν ἴδιον τρόπον, εἰ γονέας εὖ ποιεῖ, εἰ τὰς στρατείας ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως ἐστράτευται, εἰ ἱερὰ πατρῷα ἔστιν, εἰ τὰ τέλη τελεῖ.*

ἀνερωτήσας, κ[ά]λει, φησίν, τούτων τοὺς μάρτυρας.
ἐπειδὰν δὲ παράσχηται τοὺς μάρτυρας ἐπερωτᾷ,
τούτου βούλεταί τις κατηγορεῖν; κἂν μὲν ᾖ τις 4
κατήγορος, δοὺς κατηγορίαν καὶ ἀπολογίαν, οὕτω
δίδωσιν ἐν μὲν τῇ βουλῇ τὴν ἐπιχειροτονίαν, ἐν δὲ
τῷ δικαστηρίῳ τὴν ψῆφον· ἐὰν δὲ μηδεὶς βούληται
κατηγορεῖν, εὐθὺς δίδωσι τὴν ψῆφον· καὶ πρότερον
μὲν εἷς ἐνέβαλλε τὴν [ψ]ῆφον, νῦν δ' ἀνάγκη πάντας
ἐστὶ διαψηφίζεσθαι περὶ αὐτῶν, ἵνα ἄν τις πονηρὸς
ὢν ἀπαλλάξῃ τοὺς κατηγόρους ἐπὶ τοῖς δικασταῖς
γένηται τοῦτον ἀποδοκιμάσαι. δοκιμασθὲν δὲ τοῦτον 5
τὸν τρόπον, βαδίζουσι πρὸς τὸν λίθον ἐφ' ο[ὗ] τὰ
τόμι' ἐστίν, ἐφ' οὗ καὶ οἱ διαιτηταὶ ὀμόσαντες
ἀποφαίνονται τὰς διαίτας καὶ οἱ μάρτυρες ἐξόμνυνται
τὰς μαρτυρίας. ἀναβάντες δ' ἐπὶ τοῦτον ὀμνύουσιν

25. *βούλεται*: MS. *βουλευται*. 33. *δοκιμασθέν*: Rutherford, Richards, Blass, H-L., K-W. *δοκιμασθέντες*, but there is no obvious reason why the final syllable should have dropped out, and the writer appears to have been fond of accusatives absolute. 34. *ἐφ' οὗ*: so H-L.; 1st ed. and K-W. *ὑφ' ᾧ*: *cf.* note below.

34. *πρὸς τὸν λίθον*: *cf.* Harpocration (*s.v.* *λίθος*), *ἐοίκασι δ' Ἀθηναῖοι πρὸς τινὶ λίθῳ τοὺς ὅρκους ποιεῖσθαι, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ* (Rose, *Frag.* 377).

ἐφ' οὗ τὰ τόμι' ἐστίν: the correct reading of these words is due to van Leeuwen (*Mnemosyne*, vol. XIX). In the first edition they were given as *ὑφ' ᾧ τὰ ταμιεῖά* (MS. *ταμι*) *ἐστιν*, on the strength of the parallel passage in Pollux quoted in the following note. Van Leeuwen, however, quotes Bergk's emendation of Pollux, *ἐφ' οὗ τὰ τόμια ὑός*, and refers to Dem. p. 642, 18 (*ὅρκον . . ποιήσει . . . στὰς ἐπὶ τῶν τομίων κάπρου καὶ κριοῦ καὶ ταύρου, κ.τ.λ.*) and Arist. *Lysist.* 186 *seq.*; and there can be little doubt that this correction is right. The doubtful letters (*ε* in *ἐφ'* and *ο* in *τόμια*) are rather roughly formed, but there is no doubt that they can be read as here given.

37. *ὀμνύουσιν κ.τ.λ.*: the passage in Pollux (VIII. 86) quoted above continues, *ἐπηρώτα δ' ἡ βουλή, ὤμνυον δ' οὗτοι πρὸς τῇ βασιλείῳ στοᾷ, ἐπὶ τοῦ λίθου ὑφ' ᾧ τὰ ταμιεῖα, συμφυλάξειν τοὺς νόμους καὶ μὴ δωροδοκήσειν ἢ χρυσοῦν ἀνδριάντα ἀποτῖσαι. εἶτα ἐντεῦθεν εἰς ἀκρόπολιν ἀνελθόντες ὤμνυον*

δικαίως ἄρξειν καὶ κατὰ τοὺς νόμους, καὶ δῶρα μὴ λήψεσθαι τῆς ἀρχῆς ἕνεκα, κἄν τι λάβωσι ἀνδριάντα ἀναθήσειν χρυσοῦν. ἐντεῦθεν δ' ὀμόσαντες εἰς ἀκρόπολιν βαδίζουσιν καὶ πάλιν ἐκεῖ ταὐτὰ ὀμνύουσι, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτ' εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰσέρχονται.

56. *Λαμβάνουσι δὲ καὶ παρέδρους ὅ τε ἄρχων
καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ πολέμαρχος δύο ἕκαστος οὓς
ἂν βούληται, καὶ οὗτοι δοκιμάζονται ἐν τῷ δικασ-
τηρίῳ πρὶν παρεδρεύειν, καὶ εὐθύνας διδόασιν ἐπὰν*
2 *παρεδρεύσωσιν. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἄρχων εὐθὺς εἰσελθὼν
πρῶτον μὲν κηρύττει ὅσα τις εἶχεν πρὶν αὐτὸν
εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ἀρχήν, ταῦτ' ἔχειν καὶ κρατεῖν*
3 *μέχρι ἀρχῆς τέλους. ἔπειτα χορηγοὺς τραγῳδοῖς
καθίστησι τρεῖς ἐξ ἁπάντων Ἀθηναίων τοὺς πλου-
σιωτάτους· πρότερον δὲ καὶ κωμῳδοῖς καθίστη
πέντε, νῦν δὲ τούτοις αἱ φυλαὶ φέρουσιν. ἔπειτα*

LVI. 2. *καὶ ὁ βασιλεύς*: om. Harp. *ἕκαστος*: *ἑκάτερος* Harp. 3. *ἄν*: MS. *εαν*. 4. *ἐπάν*: H-L. *ἐπειδάν*. 8. *ἀρχῆς*: MS. apparently *αρκης*. 11. *τούτοις*: Wyse, K-W. *τούτους*.

ταὐτά. Further, in the excerpts from Heraclides *περὶ πολιτείας Ἀθηναίων* (*cf.* Rose, ed. 1886, *Frag.* 611), which was evidently an epitome of Aristotle, we have the sentence *εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἐννέα ἄρχοντες θεσμοθέται, οἳ δοκιμασθέντες ὀμνύουσι δικαίως ἄρξειν καὶ δῶρα μὴ λήψεσθαι ἢ ἀνδριάντα χρυσοῦν ἀναθήσειν*.

LVI. 1. *Λαμβάνουσι ... παρεδρεύσωσιν*: Harpocration (*s.v. πάρεδρος*) quotes this passage as from Aristotle *ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ*, with the exception that he (or his MSS.) omits the words *καὶ ὁ βασιλεύς* (Rose, *Frag.* 389) and gives *ἑκάτερος* for *ἕκαστος*. That the king archon had two *πάρεδροι* as well as the archon and the polemarch is confirmed by Pollux (VIII. 92).

11. *πέντε*: in the fifth century the number of competitors admitted in comedy was three, as in tragedy; but at the beginning of the fourth century it was raised to five (Haigh, *Attic Theatre*, pp. 30, 31).

τούτοις: Mr. Wyse thinks *τούτους* necessary here and in l. 17, quoting Dem. p. 996, 22 *seq.* (*οὐκοῦν ... οἴσουσί με, ἂν χορηγὸν ἢ γυμνα-*

παραλαβὼν τοὺς χορηγοὺς τοὺς ἐνηνεγμένους ὑπὸ τῶν φυλῶν εἰς Διονύσια ἀνδράσιν καὶ παισὶν καὶ κωμῳδο[ῖ]ς, καὶ εἰς Θαργήλια ἀνδράσιν καὶ παισὶν (εἰσὶ δ' οἱ μὲν εἰς Διονύσια κατὰ φυλάς, εἰς Θαργήλια [δὲ] δυοῖν φυλαῖν εἷς· παρέχει δ' ἐν μ[έρει] ἑκατέρα τῶν φυλῶν), τούτοις τὰς ἀντιδόσεις ποιεῖ καὶ τὰς σκήψεις εἰσ[άγει ἐά]ν τις ἢ λελητουργη[κέ]ν[αι] φῇ π[ρό]τερον ταύτην τὴν λητουργ[ίαν, ἢ ἀ]τελὴς εἶναι λελη[τουργηκὼς ἑ]τέραν λητουργίαν καὶ τῶν χρόνων αὐτῷ [τῆς ἀτελ]είας μὴ ἐξεληλ[λυ]θό[των, ἢ τὰ μ̄] ἔτη μὴ γεγονέναι· δεῖ γὰρ τὸν τοῖς παι[σὶν

16. *δέ*: not visible in MS. (as H-L. believe), but there is a slight lacuna in which it may have stood: otherwise it might be supposed to have been omitted by the scribe (so K-W.). *δυοῖν*: MS. *δυεῖν*, but this form is only found with plurals, *cf.* Meisterhans, p. 162. 17. *τούτοις*: H-L. *το[ῦτον]*, inside preceding parenthesis, after Richards (1st ed. *τούτοις* in same position, corr. K-W.). 18. *τὰς σκήψεις*: MS. *τασκηψεις*; for *τάς* the abbreviation for *τῆς* seems to have been written first, and then an *α* has been inserted without the corrector perceiving that another *σ* was necessary. 18–22. *ἐάν τις . . . γεγονέναι*: the supplements in the first part of this passage (to *πρότερον*) are due to Dr. Sandys. K-W. [λ]έγῃ for *φῇ*, *λελητουρ[γηκέναι γάρ]* for *λελητουργηκώς*, *τὸν χρόνον* for *τῶν χρόνων* (avowedly against MS.), *ἐξελθ[εῖν]* for *ἐξεληλυθότων*, and [*τὰ νόμιμ'*] for *τὰ μ̄*. In all cases the traces in the MS. appear to support the reading in the text. The readings of H-L. are admitted by themselves not to be in accordance with the MS. 19. *λητουργίαν*: MS. at first *λειτουργιαν*, but corrected.

σίαρχον ἢ ἑστιάτορα ἢ ἐάν τι τῶν ἄλλων φέρωσιν;). But *τούτοις* here takes up *κωμῳδοῖς*, the object (*χορηγούς*) to *φέρωσιν* being understood without difficulty.

13. *ἀνδράσιν καὶ παισίν*: these are the choruses for the dithyrambic competitions, in which the tribes competed against one another.

14. *Θαργήλια*: the dithyrambic chorus for men at this festival is mentioned by Lysias (*De Dono* § 2, p. 161), and that for boys, as well as the fact that two tribes combined to provide the choruses at this festival, by Antiphon (*De Chor.* § 11, p. 142). As to the duties of the archon in respect of the Thargelia, Pollux (VIII. 89) says *ὁ δὲ ἄρχων διατίθησι μὲν Διονύσια καὶ Θαργήλια μετὰ τῶν ἐπιμελητῶν*, and the Lex. rhet. Cantabrig. (p. 670, 4), *ἔχει δὲ ἐπιμέλειαν χορηγοὺς καταστῆσαι εἰς Διονύσια καὶ Θαργήλια, ἐπιμελεῖται δὲ καὶ τῶν εἰς Δῆλον καὶ τῶν ἀλλαχόσε πεμπομένων Ἀθήνηθεν χορῶν* (Rose, *Frag.* 381).

22. *δεῖ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.*: Harpocration (*s.v. ὅτι νόμος*) refers to this passage,

*χορη]γοῦντα ὑπὲρ τετταρά[κον]τα ἔτη γεγονέναι.
καθίστησι δὲ καὶ εἰς Δῆλον χορηγοὺς καὶ ἀρχ[ι-
θ]εώ[ρους τ]ῷ τριακοντορίῳ τῷ τοὺς ἠιθέους ἄγοντι.
4 πομπῶν δ' ἐπιμελεῖ[ται τῆς τε] τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ
γιγνομένης ὅταν οἰκουρῶσι μύ[σ]ται, καὶ τῆς Διο-
νυσίων τῶν [μεγά]λων μετὰ τῶν ἐπιμελητῶν,
οὓς πρότερον μὲν ὁ δῆμος ἐχειροτόνει δέκα ὄντας,
[καὶ τὰ] εἰς τὴν πομπὴν ἀναλώματα παρ' αὑτῶν
ἤν[εγκ]ον, νῦν δ' ἕνα τῆς φυλ[ῆς ἑκά]στης κληροῖ
5 καὶ δίδωσιν εἰς τὴν κατασκευὴν ἑκατὸν μνᾶς. ἐπι-
μελ[εῖται] δὲ καὶ τῆς εἰς Θαργήλια καὶ τῆς τῷ Διὶ
τῷ Σωτῆρι. διοικεῖ δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα τῶ[ν Διον]υ-
σίων οὗτος καὶ τῶν Θαργηλίων. ἑορτῶν μὲν οὖν
6 ἐπιμελεῖται τούτων. γραφαὶ δ[ὲ καὶ δ]ίκαι λαγχά-
νονται πρὸς αὐτόν, ἃς ἀνακρίνας εἶτ' [εἰς δι]καστήριον
εἰσά[γει, γο]νέων κακώσεως (αὗται δέ εἰσιν ἀζήμιοι*

24. *ἀρχιθεώρους*: so Torr, who refers to C. I. G. 158 a, 33, followed by H-L.; Fraenkel, K-W. *ἀρχιθέωρον*. It is uncertain whether there was more than one *ἀρχιθέωρος*. 26. *ἐπιμελεῖται*: the first *ι* is doubtful, and might be an *ε*. 27. *γιγνομένης*: MS. *γινομενης*. *μύσται*: K-W. and H-L. prefix *οἱ*. 31. *ἤνεγκον*: K-W. *ἀνήλισκον*, apparently as MS. reading, which does not seem admissible. 34. *τῶν*: H-L. *τὸ[ν τῶν]*, as the MS. reading, but apparently wrongly. 35. *τῶν*: K-W. prefix *τόν*. 37. *εἶτ' εἰς*: K-W. *εἰς τ[ὸ]*, as the MS. reading; H-L. *εἶτ' εἰς ⟨τό⟩*. It is difficult to be certain about the MS. reading.

ὅτι νόμος ἐστὶν ὑπὲρ μ' ἔτη γενόμενον χορηγεῖν παισὶν Αἰσχίνης τε ἐν τῷ κατὰ Τιμάρχου φησὶ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ (Rose, *Frag.* 431).

27. *ὅταν οἰκουρῶσι μύσται*: apparently this refers to the ceremony which took place in the course of the Eleusinia, on the 18th of Boedromion, when the Epidauria were celebrated at the temple of Asclepius, and the initiated slept in the temple.

36. *γραφαὶ δὲ κ.τ.λ.*: a summary of the following passage is given by Pollux (VIII. 89), *δίκαι δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν λαγχάνονται κακώσεως, παρανοίας, εἰς δατητῶν αἵρεσιν, ἐπιτροπῆς ὀρφανῶν, ἐπιτρόπων καταστάσεις, κλήρων καὶ ἐπικλήρων ἐπιδικασίαι. ἐπιμελεῖται δὲ καὶ τῶν γυναικῶν αἳ ἂν φῶσιν ἐπ' ἀνδρὸς τελευτῇ κύειν, καὶ τοὺς οἴκους ἐκμισθοῖ τῶν ὀρφανῶν* (Rose, *Frag.* 381).

τῷ βουλομένῳ δ[ιώκ]ειν), ὀρφανῶν κ[ακώ]σεως (αὗται
δ' εἰσὶ κατὰ τῶν ἐπιτρόπων), ἐπικλήρου κακώσε[ως]
(αὗται δέ εἰσι κατὰ [τῶν] ἐπιτρόπων καὶ τῶν συνοι-
κούντων), οἴκου ὀρφανικοῦ κακώσεως (εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ
[αὗται κατὰ τῶν] ἐπιτρό[π]ων), παρανοίας, ἐάν τις
αἰτιᾶταί τινα παρανοοῦντα τὰ [ἑαυτοῦ κτήματα
ἀ]πολλύν[αι], εἰς δατητῶν αἵρεσιν, ἐάν τις μὴ θέλῃ
[κ]οινὰ [τὰ ὄντα νέμεσθαι], εἰς ἐπιτροπῆς κατάστασιν,
εἰς ἐπιτροπῆς διαδικασίαν, εἰς [ἐμφανῶν κατά-
στασ]ιν, †ἐπίτ[ροπ]ον αὐτὸν ἐγγράψαι†, κλήρων καὶ
ἐπικλήρων ἐπι[δικασίαι. ἐπιμελεῖτ]αι δὲ καὶ τῶν 7
[ὀρφ]ανῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπικλήρων καὶ τῶν γυναικῶν
ὅσαι ἂν τελευ[τήσαντος τοῦ ἀνδρ]ὸς σκή[πτω]ν-
ται κύειν· καὶ κύριός ἐστι τοῖς ἀδικοῦσιν ἐπιβάλ-
[λειν ἢ εἰσάγειν εἰς] τὸ δικα[στή]ριον. μισθοῖ δὲ

44. *τὰ ἑαυτοῦ κτήματα*: a shorter supplement (about 10 letters) is required. H-L. *τὰ πατρῷα*, after Wyse, but this is too short; K-W. *τὸν οἶκον*, which is also too short and moreover the *a* of *τά* is practically certain. 45. *δατητῶν*: MS. *διαιτητων*, but *cf.* quotations in note below. 47. *εἰς ἐμφανῶν κατάστασιν*: so K-W.; the *s* of *εἰs* is not absolutely certain. If this is right (and the quotation from Harp. in the note below supports it), the following words become meaningless, and are probably part of a gloss on *ἐπιτροπῆς διαδικασίαν*. 2nd ed. *εἰ [πλείονες τῆς αὐτῆς θέλουσ]ιν*, H-L. *[ἐὰν πλείους ἅμα ἐθέλωσ]ιν*, but *ει* is certain in MS. H-L. also *ἐπίτ[ροπον τ]ὸν αὐτόν* against the MS., which will not hold so much in the lacuna. Poland *ἐ[άν τις ἀμφισβητῇ δε]ῖν*, after Lipsius. 48. *ἐγγράψαι*: MS. *ενγραψαι*. 51. The letters visible are *οσσκη*, not *ροσκη* as K-W. give them. 53. *ἢ εἰσάγειν*: so Lipsius, K-W.; 1st ed.

45. *εἰς δατητῶν αἵρεσιν*: Harpocration explains the phrase, and refers to Aristotle as using it *ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ*. The Lex. rhet. Cantabrig. quotes Aristotle nearly verbally, *ἐπὶ τῶν διανεμόντων τὰ κοινά τισιν, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ, δίκαι λαγχάνονται πρὸς τὸν ἄρχοντα ἄλλαι τινὲς καὶ εἰς δατητῶν αἵρεσιν, ὅταν μὴ θέλῃ κοινὰ τὰ ὄντα νέμεσθαι* (Rose, *Frag.* 383).

47. *εἰς ἐμφανῶν κατάστασιν*: this supplement of the lacuna seems necessary in order to account for the reference of Harpocration (*s.v.*), *ὁ δὲ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ πρὸς τὸν ἄρχοντά φησι λαγχάνεσθαι ταύτην τὴν δίκην, τὸν δὲ ἀνακρίνοντα εἰσάγειν εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον* (*Frag.* 382).

καὶ τοὺς οἴκους τῶν ὀρφανῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπι[κλήρων] . . . . α καὶ δ[ατη]τὴς γένηται καὶ τὰ ἀποτιμήματα λαμβάν[ει· καὶ τοὺς ἐπιτρόπους] ἐὰν μ[ὴ ἀπο]δῶσι τοῖς παισὶν τὸν σῖτον οὗτος εἰσπράττει. καὶ ὁ [μὲν ἄρχων ἐπιμελεῖτ]αι τούτ[ων].

57. [Ὁ δὲ] βασιλεὺς πρῶτον μὲν μυστηρίων ἐπιμελεῖ[ται μετὰ τῶν ἐπιμελητῶν οὓς] ὁ δῆμ[ος χ]ειροτονεῖ, δύο μὲν ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἁπάντων, ἕνα δ' [Εὐμολπιδῶν, ἕνα] δὲ Κηρ[ύκω]ν. ἔπειτα Διονυσίων τῶν ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ· ταῦτα δ' ἐστὶ [πομπὴ καὶ ἀγών. τὴν] μὲν οὖν πομπὴν κοινῇ πέμπουσιν ὅ τε [Col. 29.] βασιλεὺς καὶ οἱ ἐπιμεληταί· τὸν δὲ ἀγῶνα διατίθησιν ὁ βασιλεύς. τίθησι δὲ καὶ τοὺς τῶν λαμ-

and H-L. *ζημίαν ἢ ἄγειν*, which seems too long for the lacuna. 55. *δατητής*: neither K-W. nor H-L. fill the lacuna. The final η is corrected from ει. 56. *καὶ τοὺς ἐπιτρόπους*: so E. H. Brooks, K-W. H-L., Sandys *καὶ οἱ ἐπίτροποι*. For the double acc. *cf.* Dem. p. 1227, 9. *ἐάν*: H-L. *οἳ ἄν*. 57. *ἀποδῶσι*: K-W. [*δι*]*δῶσι*, H-L. [*ἀποδί*]*δωσι*. 58. *ὁ μὲν ἄρχων*: so K-W., H-L.; 1st ed. *οὗτος μὲν οὖν*, Blass *ὁ μὲν οὖν ἄρχων*. LVII. 3. *χειροτονεῖ*: *ἐχειροτόνει* Harp., though he continues the words of Aristotle as far as *Κηρύκων*. 4. *Εὐμολπιδῶν . . . Κηρύκων*: *ἐξ Εὐμολπιδῶν . . . ἐκ Κηρύκων* Harp., and so K-W., H-L. 5. *Ληναίῳ*: MS. *ληναιων*. *πομπὴ καὶ ἀγών*: supplied by H-L. though somewhat short for the lacuna. K-W. *πομπὴ καὶ μουσικῆς ἀγών*, which is too long. 8. *τίθησι*: K-W., H-L., Richards, Gertz *διατίθησι*.

57. *σῖτον*: Harpocration (*s.v.*) says *σῖτος καλεῖται ἡ διδομένη πρόσοδος εἰς τροφὴν ταῖς γυναιξὶν ἢ τοῖς ὀρφανοῖς, ὡς ἐξ ἄλλων μαθεῖν ἔστι καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Σόλωνος α' ἄξονος καὶ ἐκ τῆς Ἀριστοτέλους Ἀθηναίων πολιτείας* (Rose, *Frag.* 384). As women and children were under the archon's special care, it is tolerably certain that this is the passage referred to, but there is nothing in the words of Harpocration to prove the exact wording of the sentence.

LVII. 1. *Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς . . . Κηρύκων*: quoted by Harpocration, *s.v.* *ἐπιμελητὴς τῶν μυστηρίων* (Rose, *Frag.* 386).

5. *Διονυσίων τῶν ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ*: Pollux (VIII. 90) says *ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς μυστηρίων προέστηκε μετὰ τῶν ἐπιμελητῶν καὶ Ληναίων καὶ ἀγώνων τῶν ἐπὶ λαμπάδι, καὶ τὰ περὶ τὰς πατρίους θυσίας διοικεῖ* (Rose, *Frag.* 385).

πάδων ἀγῶνας ἅπαντας· ὡς δ' ἔπος εἰπεῖν καὶ
τὰς πατρίους θυσίας διοικεῖ οὗτος πάσας. γραφαὶ 2
δὲ λαγχάνονται πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀσεβείας, κἄν τις
ἱερωσύνης ἀμφισβητῇ πρός τινα· [διαδι]κάζει δὲ
καὶ τοῖς γένεσι καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τὰς ἀμφισβητήσεις
τὰς ὑπὲρ [τῶν γε]ρῶν ἁπάσας οὗτος. λαγχάνονται
δὲ καὶ αἱ τοῦ φόνου δίκαι πᾶσαι πρὸς τοῦτον,
καὶ ὁ προαγορεύων εἴργεσθαι τῶν νομίμων οὗτός
ἐστιν. εἰσὶ δὲ φόν[ου] δίκαι καὶ τραύματος· ἂν 3
μὲν ἐκ προνοίας ἀποκτείνῃ, ἐγγρ[άφεται] ἐν Ἀρείῳ
πάγῳ, καὶ φάρμακον ἐὰν ἀποκτείνῃ δούς, καὶ
πυρκαιᾶς· [ταῦ]τα γὰρ ἡ βουλὴ μόνα δικάζει· τῶν

9. *καί*: del. H-L., K-W. 12. *πρός τινα*: so MS. apparently; Lex. Seg. *προστιμᾷ*, which might be read here also, but it does not seem appropriate. 14. *γερῶν*: so Lex. Seg.; Richards *ἱερῶν*, but there seems no reason to depart from the evidence on the point. 18. *ἐγγράφεται*: MS. apparently *ενγρ-*: K-W. *ἢ τρώ[σ]ῃ*, which is not absolutely impossible, H-L. ⟨*τις*⟩, *γράφεται*. 19. *φάρμακον*: K-W. alter to *φαρμάκων*, after Pollux, but it seems unnecessary.

10. *γραφαὶ δὲ κ.τ.λ.*: the passage of Pollux just quoted gives a summary of the present section, *δίκαι δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν λαγχάνονται ἀσεβείας καὶ ἱερωσύνης ἀμφισβητήσεως. καὶ τοῖς γένεσι καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι* (MSS. *ἱεροῖς*) *πᾶσιν αὐτὸς δικάζει, καὶ τὰς τοῦ φόνου δίκας εἰς Ἄρειον πάγον εἰσάγει καὶ τὸν στέφανον ἀποθέμενος σὺν αὐτοῖς δικάζει. προαγορεύει δὲ τοῖς ἐν αἰτίᾳ ἀπέχεσθαι μυστηρίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων νομίμων. δικάζει δὲ καὶ τὰς τῶν ἀψύχων δίκας.* The Lex. Seg. (p. 219, 14) quotes verbally from *γραφαί* to *πρὸς τοῦτον*, though without acknowledging the source (Rose, *Frag.* 385).

17. *ἂν μὲν ἐκ προνοίας κ.τ.λ.*: Pollux (VIII. 117) evidently draws from this passage; *Ἄρειος πάγος· ἐδίκαζε δὲ φόνου καὶ τραύματος ἐκ προνοίας καὶ πυρκαιᾶς καὶ φαρμάκων ἐάν τις ἀποκτείνῃ δούς.* *Cf.* also Dem. *contr. Arist.* § 24, p. 628, *γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν μὲν τῷ νόμῳ, τὴν βουλὴν δικάζειν φόνου καὶ τραύματος ἐκ προνοίας καὶ πυρκαιᾶς καὶ φαρμάκων, ἐάν τις ἀποκτείνῃ δούς.*

20. *τῶν δ' ἀκουσίων καὶ βουλεύσεως*: Harpocration (*s. v. ἐπὶ Παλλαδίῳ*), *δικαστήριόν ἐστιν οὕτω καλούμενον, ὡς καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ, ἐν ᾧ δικάζουσιν ἀκουσίου φόνου καὶ βουλεύσεως οἱ ἐφέται* (Rose, *Frag.* 417). The *ἐφέται* are also mentioned in this connection by Hesychius and Eustathius, but Aristotle does not appear to have noticed them here, though the general statement in l. 30 (if the supplement is right) covers this passage. Pollux too (VIII. 118) does

δ' ἀκουσίων καὶ βουλεύσεως κἂν οἰκέτην ἀποκτείνῃ τις ἢ μέτοικον ἢ ξένον, οἱ ἐ[πὶ] Πα[λλ]αδίῳ· ἐὰν δ' ἀποκτεῖναι μέν τις ὁμολογῇ, φῇ δὲ κατὰ τοὺς νόμους, ο[ἷον] μοιχὸν λαβὼν ἢ ἐν πολέμῳ ἀγνοήσας ἢ ἐν ἄθλῳ ἀγωνιζόμενος, τού[τῳ] ἐπὶ Δελφινίῳ δικάζουσιν· ἐὰν δὲ φεύγων φυγὴν ὧν αἴδεσίς ἐστιν αἰτίαν [ἔχῃ] ἀποκτεῖναι ἢ τρῶσαί τινα, τούτῳ δ' ἐν Φρεαττοῖ δικάζουσιν· ὁ δὲ [ἀπολογ]εῖται προσ-

22. *οἱ ἐπὶ Παλλαδίῳ*: so apparently MS.; K-W. *τούτ[ῳ μὲν ἐπὶ] Π.*, but neither is there room for this, nor are the letters *τουτ* discernible in the MS. H-L. [*οἱ ἐφέται ἐπὶ Π.*], after Brooks, but the space will not admit it. 25. *τούτῳ ἐπί*: K-W. *τούτ[ῳ] δ'[ἐπ]ί*, but the *δ* is not discernible, and the space would not admit it. 1st ed. *τούτῳ ἐν τῷ ἐπί*, but there is not space for *ἐν τῷ*. 26. *αἴδεσις*: in the MS. a letter has been written above the *δ*, which is probably a badly formed *ρ*, in which case the corrector has altered the rare word *αἴδεσις* into the more familiar *αἵρεσις*, which, however, makes nonsense of the passage. 27. *ἔχῃ ἀποκτεῖναι*: so read by K-W., apparently rightly; H-L. *προσλάβῃ κτεῖναι*, after 1st ed. 28. *Φρεαττοῖ*: MS. *φρεατου*, which K-W. retain.

not refer to them. Harpocration also refers in another place (*s. v.* *βουλεύσεως*) to Aristotle as stating that trials of this description took place in the Palladium (Rose, *Frag.* 418). Prof. Mayor cites in addition schol. Aeschin. *de Fals. Leg.* § 87, *ἐδίκαζον δ' ἀκουσίου φόνου καὶ βουλεύσεως καὶ οἰκέτην ἢ μέτοικον ἢ ξένον ἀποκτείναντι* (MSS. *ἀποκτεῖναι*, corr. Sauppe; Wyse suggests *κεἴ τις . . . ἀποκτείνειε*. The law itself would presumably run *κἂν τις . . . ἀποκτείνῃ*, as here, and the scholiast may have quoted verbally).

25. *ἐπὶ Δελφινίῳ*: Harpocration (*s. v.*), *δικάζονται δ' ἐνταῦθα οἱ ὁμολογοῦντες μὲν ἀπεκτονέναι, δικαίως δὲ πεποιηκέναι τοῦτο λέγοντες, ὡς Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἀριστοκράτους δηλοῖ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ* (Rose, *Frag.* 419). Pollux (VIII. 119), Suidas, Eustathius, *etc.*, say substantially the same. If the article *οἱ* is right in l. 22 it might perhaps be supplied here, but it is not necessary.

26. *ὧν αἴδεσίς ἐστιν*: the corresponding phrase in Demosthenes (*contr. Aristocr.* § 77, p. 645), where he is explaining the character of the court *ἐν Φρεαττοῖ*, runs *ἐπ' ἀκουσίῳ φόνῳ πεφευγώς, μήπω τῶν ἐκβαλόντων αὐτὸν ᾐδεσμένων*. The meaning therefore is that the party has committed an involuntary homicide, but has to remain in exile during the resentment of the relatives of the deceased. On their relenting he might return (which would not be the case if the homicide was intentional, under which circumstances there would not be *αἴδεσις*), but at the time supposed they have not yet relented and therefore he is still in exile.

ορμισάμενος ἐν πλοίῳ. δικάζουσι δ' οἱ λαχόντες 4 τα[ῦτα ἐφέται] πλὴν τῶν ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ γιγνομένων· εἰσάγει δ' ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ δικάζουσι[ν] . . . . αι[ο]ι καὶ ὑπαίθριοι. καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς ὅταν δικάζῃ περιαιρεῖται τὸν στέφανον. ὁ δὲ τὴν αἰτίαν ἔχων τὸν μὲν ἄλλον χρόνον εἴργεται τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ οὐδ' εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν δ[ίκαιον ἐ]μβαλεῖν αὐτῷ· τότε δ' εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν εἰσελθὼν ἀπολογεῖται. ὅταν δὲ μὴ εἰδῇ τὸν ποιήσαντα, τῷ δράσαντι λαγχάνει. δικάζει δ' ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ οἱ φυλοβασιλεῖς καὶ τὰς τῶν ἀψύχων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ζῴων.

58. Ὁ δὲ πολέμαρχος θύει μὲν θυσίας τήν τε τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι τῇ ἀγροτέρᾳ καὶ τῷ Ἐνυαλίῳ, διατίθησι

30. *ἐφέται*: H-L. *δικασταί*, after Paton. *Cf.* note below. 32. . . . . *αιοι*: H-L. *σκοταῖοι*, after Sandys, but this does not suit the traces in the MS. 35. The correct reading of this and the two next lines is due in the first instance to Wyse and Blass. *δίκαιον*: so van Leeuwen; H-L., K-W. *δέδοται*, after Gertz. *ἐμβαλεῖν*: K-W. *ἐμβάλλειν*, against MS. 36. *μή*: H-L. *μηδείς*, but there is not room in the MS. 39. *ζῴων*: MS. *ζωων*. LVIII. 1. *θύει μέν*: H-L. (after 1st ed.) *ποιεῖται*. *τήν τε τῇ*: K-W. *τῇ τε*, against MS. 2. *Ἐνυαλίῳ*: this name appears to have been written twice in the MS. The one first written is struck out, and over that is written *ενυω*, which is also struck out. H-L. read the repetition of the word as *τὴν ἐνιαυσίαν*, but wrongly. The quotation from Pollux (see note below) confirms the name *Ἐνυαλίῳ*.

30. *ἐφέται*: *cf.* Harpocration (*s. v. ἐφέται*), *οἱ δικάζοντες τὰς ἐφ' αἵματι κρίσεις ἐπὶ Παλλαδίῳ καὶ ἐπὶ Πρυτανείῳ καὶ ἐπὶ Δελφινίῳ καὶ ἐν Φρεαττοῖ ἐφέται ἐκαλοῦντο.* Harpocration must almost certainly have derived his statement from Aristotle, and this seems to be the only place in which the word can have occurred.

33. *περιαιρεῖται τὸν στέφανον*: *cf.* the quotation from Pollux (VIII. 90) given above, in note on l. 10.

36. *ὅταν δὲ μὴ εἰδῇ κ.τ.λ*: *cf.* [Dem.] *contr. Euerg. et Mnesil.* § 69, p. 1160 (cited by Wyse), *ὀνομαστὶ μὲν μηδενὶ προαγορεύειν, τοῖς δεδρακόσι δὲ καὶ κτείνασιν*, and Plato *Laws* p. 874 B, *προαγορεύειν τὸν φόνον τῷ δράσαντι.*

LVIII. 1. *Ὁ δὲ πολέμαρχος κ.τ.λ.*: Pollux (VIII. 91) paraphrases the passage thus, *ὁ δὲ πολέμαρχος θύει μὲν Ἀρτέμιδι ἀγροτέρᾳ καὶ τῷ Ἐνυαλίῳ, διατίθησι δὲ τὸν ἐπιτάφιον ἀγῶνα τῶν ἐν πολέμῳ ἀποθανόντων, καὶ τοῖς περὶ Ἁρμόδιον ἐναγίζει. δίκαι δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν λαγχάνονται μετοίκων,*

δ' ἀγῶνα τὸν ἐπιτάφιον τοῖς τετελευτηκόσιν ἐν τῷ
πολέμῳ, καὶ Ἁρμοδίῳ καὶ Ἀριστογείτονι ἐναγίσματα
2 ποιεῖ. δίκαι δὲ λαγχάνονται πρὸς αὐτὸν ἴδιαι μὲν αἵ
τε τοῖς μετοίκοις καὶ τοῖς ἰσοτελέσι καὶ τοῖς προ-
ξένοις γιγνόμεναι. καὶ δεῖ τοῦτον λαβόντα καὶ δια-
νείμαντα δέκα μέρη, τὸ λαχὸν ἑκάστῃ τῇ φυλῇ μέρος
προσθεῖναι, τοὺς δὲ τὴν φυλὴν δικάζοντας το[ῖς]
3 διαιτηταῖς ἀποδοῦναι. αὐτὸς δ' εἰσάγει δίκας τάς τε
τοῦ ἀ[ποστασ]ίου καὶ ἀπροστασί[ου] καὶ κλήρων καὶ
ἐπικλήρων τοῖς μετοίκοις, καὶ τἄλλ' ὅσα τοῖς πολίταις
ὁ ἄρχων ταῦτα τοῖς μετοίκοις ὁ πολέμαρχος.

59. Οἱ δὲ θεσμοθέται πρῶτον μὲν τοῦ προγράψαι
τὰ δικαστήριά εἰσι κύριοι τίσιν ἡμέραις δεῖ δικάζειν,
[ἔπ]ε[ιτα] τοῦ δοῦναι ταῖς ἀρχαῖς· καθότι γὰρ ἂν
2 οὗτοι δῶσιν, κατὰ τοῦτο χρῶνται. ἔτι δὲ τὰς
εἰσαγγελίας εἰσαγγέλλουσιν εἰς τὸν δῆμον καὶ τὰς

3. *τοῖς τετελευτηκόσιν*: the MS. prefixes *και*, but it is probably a blunder, though K-W. retain it. *τῷ*: Rutherford *τῳ*, but the article is sufficiently intelligible. 4. *Ἀριστογείτονι*: MS. *αριστογιτονι*. 5. *μέν*: K-W. alter to *μόνον*. 7. *γιγνόμεναι*: MS. *γινομεναι*. 8. *μέρος*: bracketed by K-W. 11. *τοῦ*: bracketed by K-W. LIX. 5. *εἰσαγγέλλουσιν εἰς τὸν δῆμον*: bracketed by K-W.; *εἰσάγουσιν* Schol. Plat. *Phaedr*. 235 and Schol. Aesch. I. 16, which Gomperz accepts; but Pollux supports *εἰσαγγέλλουσιν*.

ἰσοτελῶν, προξένων (Rose's addition *ξένων* is shown by the text of Aristotle to be unnecessary). *καὶ διανέμει τὸ λαχόν, ἑκάστῃ φυλῇ τι μέρος, τὸ μὲν διαιτηταῖς παραδιδούς, εἰσάγων δὲ δίκας ἀποστασίου, ἀπροστασίου, κλήρων μετοίκων* (Rose, *Frag*. 387).

10. *αὐτὸς δ' εἰσάγει*: Harpocration (*s. v. πολέμαρχος*) quotes this passage verbally, introducing it with the words *Ἀριστοτέλης δ' ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ διεξελθὼν ὅσα διοικεῖ ὁ πολέμαρχος, πρὸς ταῦτά φησιν* "*αὐτός τε εἰσάγει .... ὁ πολέμαρχος.*" The first part, as far as *ἐπικλήρων*, is again quoted *s. v. ἀποστασίου*, with the difference that *οὗτος δέ* stands in place of *αὐτός τε* (Rose, *Frag*. 388).

LIX. 1. *Οἱ δὲ θεσμοθέται*: Pollux (VIII. 87, 88) quotes the whole of this passage almost verbally, as far as *τὰ ψευδομαρτύρια ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου*, and Harpocration (*s. v. θεσμοθέται*) says *ὁ δὲ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ διέρχεται ὅσα οὗτοι πράττουσιν* (Rose, *Frag*. 378).

*καταχειροτονίας καὶ τὰς προβολὰς ἁπάσα[ς] εἰσά-
γουσιν οὗ[τοι] καὶ γραφὰς παρανόμων καὶ νόμον μὴ
ἐπιτήδειον θεῖναι καὶ προεδρικὴν καὶ ἐπιστατικὴν
καὶ στρατηγοῖς εὐθύνας. εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ γραφαὶ πρὸς* 3
*αὐτοὺς ὧν παράστασις τίθεται, ξενίας καὶ δωροξενίας,
ἄν τις δῶρα δοὺς ἀποφύγῃ τὴν ξενίαν, καὶ συκο-
φαντίας καὶ δώρων καὶ ψευδεγγραφῆς καὶ ψευδο-
κλητείας καὶ βουλεύσεως καὶ ἀγραφίου καὶ μοιχείας.
εἰσάγουσιν δὲ καὶ τὰς δοκιμασ[ία]ς ταῖς ἀρχαῖς* 4
*ἁπάσαις καὶ τοὺς ἀπεψηφισμένους ὑπὸ τῶν δημοτῶν
καὶ τὰς καταγνώσεις [τ]ὰς ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς. εἰσάγουσι* 5
*δὲ καὶ δίκας ἰδίας, ἐμπορικὰς καὶ μεταλλικὰς καὶ
δούλων, ἄν τις τὸν ἐλεύθερον κακῶς λέγῃ. καὶ
ἐπικληροῦσι ταῖς ἀρχαῖς οὗτοι τὰ δικαστήρια τὰ ἴδια
καὶ τὰ δημόσια· καὶ τὰ σύμβολα τὰ πρὸς τὰς πόλεις* 6

7. *νόμον*: H-L. prefix *τοῦ*, after J. B. Mayor. 11. *ξενίαν*: H-L. *ξενίας*, which seems hardly necessary. 12. *ψευδεγγραφῆς*: over the second *ε* an *υ* has been written in the MS., and the first *γ*, being badly formed, resembles a *σ*; but the quotations in Harpocration leave no doubt as to the word intended. 18–20. *καὶ . . . δημόσια*: bracketed by K-W. 19. *οὗτοι τά*: so MS. apparently; 1st ed. *πάντα*, H-L. *πάντα τά*.

9. *εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ γραφαὶ . . . ξενίαν*: this passage is quoted in the Lex. rhet. Cantabrig., being introduced by the words *Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ φησὶ περὶ τῶν θεσμοθετῶν διαλεγόμενος*. There is, however, an addition, for after *δωροξενίας* occur the words *ξενίας μὲν ἐάν τις κατηγορῆται ξένος εἶναι, δωροξενίας δὲ ἐάν τις δῶρα κ.τ.λ.* The repetition of the words *ξενίας* and *δωροξενίας* would make it easy to suppose that the clause *ξενίας . . . δωροξενίας δέ* had accidentally dropped out of the present MS. of Aristotle; but Harpocration (*s. vv. παράστασις* and *δωροξενία*) proves that this is not the case (or else that his copy was equally deficient) by twice quoting the passage exactly as it stands in the text. Harpocration also (*ll. cc.* and *s. v. ἡγεμονία δικαστηρίου*) quotes the other classes of cases down to *μοιχείας* (Rose, *Frag.* 379).

20. *τὰ σύμβολα*: it is perhaps to this passage that the Lex. Seg. refers (*s. v. ἀπὸ συμβόλων δικάζει*), *Ἀθηναῖοι ἀπὸ συμβόλων ἐδίκαζον τοῖς ὑπηκόοις. οὕτως Ἀριστοτέλης* (Rose, *Frag.* 380). Harpocration explains the word *σύμβολα* as *τὰς συνθήκας ἃς ἂν ἀλλήλαις αἱ πόλεις θέμεναι τάττωσι τοῖς πολίταις ὥστε διδόναι καὶ λαμβάνειν τὰ δίκαια.*

οὗτοι κυροῦσι, καὶ τὰς δίκας τὰς ἀπὸ τῶν συμβόλων
εἰσάγουσι, καὶ τὰ ψευδομαρτύρια ἐ[ξ] Ἀρείου πάγου.
7 *τοὺς δὲ δικαστὰς κληροῦσι πάντες οἱ ἐννέα ἄρ-*
χοντες, δέκατος δ' ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ τῶν θεσμοθετῶν,
τοὺς τῆς αὐτοῦ φυλῆς ἕκαστος. τὰ μὲν οὖν περὶ
τοὺς θ̄ ἄρχοντας τοῦτον ἔχει τὸν τρόπον.

60. Κληροῦσι *δὲ καὶ ἀθλοθέτας δέκα [ἄ]νδρας,*
ἕνα τῆς φυλῆς ἑκάστης. οὗτοι δὲ δοκιμασθέντες
ἄρχουσι τέτταρ[α ἔ]τη, καὶ διοικοῦσι τήν τε πομπὴν
τῶν Παναθηναίων καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς μουσικῆς καὶ
τὸν γυμνικὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ τὴν ἱπποδρομίαν, καὶ τὸν
πέπλον ποιοῦνται καὶ τοὺς ἀμφορεῖς ποιοῦνται μετὰ
τῆς βουλῆς, καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον τοῖς ἀθληταῖς ἀπο-
2 *διδόασι. συλλέγεται δὲ τὸ ἔλαιον [ἀ]πὸ τῶν μοριῶν·*
εἰσπράττει δὲ τοὺς τὰ χωρία κεκτημένους ἐν οἷς
αἱ μορίαι εἰσὶν ὁ ἄρχων, τρία ἡμικοτύλια ἀπὸ τοῦ
στελέχους ἑκάστου. πρότερον δ' ἐπώλει τὸν καρπὸν

21. *κυροῦσι*: H-L. *κατακυροῦσι*, after Wyse. 22. *ψευδομαρτύρια*: H-L., K-W. add *τά*, but if *ἐξ' Α. π.* be taken with the verb, it is unnecessary. 23. *πάντες*: MS. *παντας*, which, however, has no force, while *πάντες* brings out the contrast between the six thesmothetae who have been the subject up to this point and the whole college of nine archons. So also H-L. 23-25. *τοὺς .... ἕκαστος*: bracketed by K-W. LX. 1. *ἀθλοθέτας*: the first three letters are strangely formed in the MS. and the word rather resembles *λογοθετας*. Possibly this was the actual word written, but if so there can be no question that it is a mistake for *αθλοθετας*, and in a hand like this a confusion between *αθλ* and *λογ* is not at all impossible. 6. *ποιοῦνται*: H-L., K-W., Gennadios remove the repetition of this word after *ἀμφορεῖς*. 8. *δὲ τό*: MS. *το δε*, altered by Gennadios, Richards, Gertz, H-L., K-W.; Hicks, K-W.[2] *τὸ δ' ἔλαιον συλλέγεται.* 10. *τρία*: MS. *τρι*, hence K-W. *τριημικοτύλιον*.

LX. 1. *ἀθλοθέτας*: *cf.* Pollux (VIII. 93), *ἀθλοθέται δέκα μέν εἰσιν, εἷς κατὰ φυλήν, δοκιμασθέντες δὲ ἄρχουσι τέτταρα ἔτη, ἐπὶ τῷ διαθεῖναι τὰ Παναθήναια, τόν τε μουσικὸν καὶ τὸν γυμνικὸν καὶ τὴν ἱπποδρομίαν.*

7. *τὸ ἔλαιον*: the scholiast on *Oed. Col.* 701 refers to this passage, *ὁ δὲ Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ τοῖς νικήσασι τὰ Παναθήναια ἐλαίου τοῦ ἐκ τῶν μοριῶν γινομένου δίδοσθαί φησιν* (Rose, *Frag.* 345).

11. *ἐπώλει*: *i.e.* formerly the state managed the cultivation of the

ἡ πόλις· καὶ εἴ τις ἐξορύξειεν ἐλαίαν μορίαν ἢ
κατάξειεν, ἔκρινεν ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλή, καὶ
εἴ του καταγνοίη, θανάτῳ τοῦτον ἐζημίουν. ἐξ οὗ
δὲ τὸ ἔλαιον ὁ τὸ χωρίον κεκτημένος ἀποτίνει, ὁ μὲν
[Col. 30.] νόμος ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ κρίσις καταλέλυται. τὸ δ' ἔλ[αιον]
ἐκ τοῦ κλήματος, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν στελεχῶν, ἐστὶ τῇ
πόλει. συλλέξας οὖν ὁ ἄρχων τὸ ἐφ' ἑαυ[τοῦ] 3
γιγνόμενον, τοῖς ταμίαις παρ[αδίδ]ωσιν εἰς Ἀκρό-
πολιν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀναβῆναι πρότερον εἰς [Ἄρε]ιον
πάγον πρὶν ἂν ἅπαν παραδῷ τοῖς ταμίαις. οἱ δὲ
ταμίαι τὸν μὲν ἄλλον χρόνον τηροῦσιν ἐν Ἀκρο-
πόλει, τοῖς δὲ Παναθηναίοις ἀπομετροῦσι τοῖς ἀθλο-
θέταις, οἱ δ' ἀθλοθέται τοῖς νικῶσι τῶν ἀγωνιστῶν.
ἔστι γὰρ ἆθλα τοῖς μὲν τὴν μουσικὴν νικῶσιν
ἀργύρια καὶ χρυσία, τοῖς δὲ τὴν εὐανδρίαν ἀσπίδες,
τοῖς δὲ τὸν γυμνικὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ τὴν ἱπποδρομίαν
ἔλαιον.

61. Χειροτονοῦσι δὲ †καὶ† τὰς πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον

12. *μορίαν*: del. H-L., Rutherford. 14. *του*: om. 1st ed.; read, apparently rightly, by H-L. K-W. *μέν*, doubtfully. 16. *ἔλαιον*: H-L. add *τό*. 17. *ἐκ* is written in the MS. as a correction of *ἀπό*. *κλήματος*: K-W. *κτήματος*, which is equally possible as the MS. reading, but it is inferior in sense. 26. *ἀργύρια καὶ χρυσία*: so also H-L.; MS. *αργυρια και χρυσα*, K-W. *ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσᾶ*, Rutherford *ἀργυρᾶ καὶ χρυσᾶ*.

sacred olives itself and sold what was not required of the oil, whereas in later times the olives were the property of private individuals, subject to the obligation to furnish a certain amount of oil to the state, for the purposes described.

21. *πρὶν ἂν ἅπαν παραδῷ τοῖς ταμίαις*: *i. e.* the archon could not take his seat in the Areopagus, at the end of his year of office, until he had paid over to the *ταμίαι* all the oil due for the year.

LXI. 1. *Χειροτονοῦσι δὲ καὶ κ.τ.λ.*: the formula *δὲ καί* with which this chapter is introduced would naturally imply that some *χειροτονητοὶ ἀρχαί* had already been spoken of; and one would expect to find a more marked transition from the discussion of the *κληρωτοὶ ἀρχαί*.

ἀρχὰς ἁπάσας, στρατηγοὺς δέκα, πρότερον μὲν ἀφ' ⟨ἑκάστης⟩ φυλῆς ἕνα, νῦν δ' ἐξ ἁπάντων· καὶ τούτους διατάττουσι τῇ χειροτονίᾳ, ἕνα μὲν ἐπὶ

LXI. 2. δέκα: MS. δε και, but Aristotle invariably gives the numbers of the magistrates; and *cf.* the quotation from Harp. in the note below. 3. ἀφ' ἑκάστης φυλῆς: MS. αφφυλης.

Moreover no account is given of the officers named at the beginning of ch. 43. The order there followed would suggest that the section dealing with the χειροτονητοὶ ἀρχαί began with an account of the three officers there mentioned, and then passed on to the military officers. If any mention was made in this treatise of the official ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει, that too would find its place here; but it is uncertain whether such an office had been formally constituted at this date. There is thus some reason for supposing that a portion of Aristotle's work has been lost at this point. On the other hand it must be observed that neither Harpocration nor any of the compilers who used this treatise so freely has any account of the officials in question. The hypothesis of lacunas is convenient but dangerous, and it is easier to suppose that a scribe wrote δὲ καί mechanically in place of δέ.

2. στρατηγούς: Harpocration (*s. v.*) mentions Aristotle's Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία as his authority for the fact that οἱ καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν χειροτονούμενοι στρατηγοὶ δέκα ἦσαν (Rose, *Frag.* 390).

3. νῦν δ' ἐξ ἁπάντων: this clears up the doubt which has existed as to whether the strategi were elected one from each tribe or from the whole people without distinction of tribe. Plutarch (*Cim.* 8) speaks of them as elected by the former method at the time when Cimon and his colleagues sat as judges in the dramatic contest at which Sophocles defeated Aeschylus (468 B.C.). On the other hand Pollux (VIII. 87) speaks of them as elected ἐξ ἁπάντων. Both statements are true, but of different periods, and Aristotle does not tell us when the change was made.

4. διατάττουσι: from this passage it appears that five of the strategi were assigned to special duties, while five were employed as occasion might demand. The five officers with specific posts are all referred to in various extant authorities, which are quoted below, but there has been nothing hitherto to show that the list was exhaustive, while there has been some reason to include one or two specific posts in addition which it now appears did not belong to the strategi, at any rate at this date. This division of posts took place between 334 and 325 B.C. according to Busolt (Müller's *Handbuch d. klass. Alterthums-Wissenschaft*, IV. 162). *Cf.* Boeckh, *Staatsh.*[3], I. 223.

ἕνα μὲν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὁπλίτας: the στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ὅπλων is mentioned in the decree in Demosthenes *De Cor.* p. 238, and again p. 265, where

τοὺς ὁπλίτας, ὃς ἡγεῖται τῶν ὁ[πλι]τῶν ἂν ἐξίωσι, ἕνα δ' ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν, ὃς φυλάττει, κἂν πόλεμος ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ γίγνηται πολεμεῖ οὗτος· δύο δ' ἐπὶ τὸν Πειραιέα, τὸν μὲν εἰς τὴν Μουνιχίαν, τὸν δ' εἰς τὴν ἀκτήν, οἳ τῆς χηλῆς ἐπιμελοῦνται καὶ τῶν ἐν Πει-

5. ὁπλίτας: MS. οπλειτας. ὁπλιτῶν: so probably MS. as given by H-L., though δ seems to have been written first and corrected to ο. K-W. πολιτῶν, as emendation to δ . . . των. 7. γίγνηται: MS. γινηται. πολεμεῖ: K-W. alter to ἡγεῖται, which seems hardly justifiable. 8. Μουνιχίαν: MS. μουνυχιαν. 9. χηλῆς: MS. apparently φ[υ]λης; emended by Torr, who is followed by H-L. 1st ed. suggested φυλακῆς, which is adopted by K-W., deleting the following καί; Wardale (*Class. Rev.* V. 273) notes that φυλῆς and φυλακῆς are repeatedly confused in the MSS. of Thucydides.

he is coupled with ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν ἱππέων. The latter, however, is not called στρατηγός, and from the present passage it appears that he must have been one of the hipparchi. In *Philipp.* I. § 26, p. 47, Demosthenes complains of the inaction of the strategi, saying that except one, ὃν ἂν ἐκπέμψητε ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον (*i.e.* the στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τοὺς ὁπλίτας) they all stay at home and do nothing but attend to sacrificial ceremonies. Schömann (*Ant. Jur. Publ.* p. 252) unnecessarily misrepresents this passage, as though Demosthenes had there mentioned a στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ἱππέων and had coupled him with the στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ὅπλων as going to war while the rest stayed at home. The title ἐπὶ τοὺς ὁπλίτας appears in an early 3rd cent. inscription (*C. I. A.* II. 302), while another of the same period has ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα (*C. I. A.* II. 331). In imperial times it appears from several inscriptions (*C. I. G.* 186, 189, 191, 192) that the στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ὅπλων was the most important of the board of strategi, as his name is given with that of the archon eponymus to indicate the year.

6. ἕνα δ' ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν: this officer is mentioned by Plutarch (*Phoc.* 32) as στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας. In a 3rd century inscription (*C. I. A.* II. 331) he appears as ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν.

8. εἰς τὴν Μουνιχίαν: *cf.* Deinarchus *contr. Philocl.* § 2, p. 108, στρατηγὸς ὑφ' ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν Μουνιχίαν καὶ τὰ νεώρια κεχειροτονημένος.

εἰς τὴν ἀκτήν: in two inscriptions of the 3rd century or later (*C. I. G.* 178, 179) there is mention of a στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν παραλίαν, who is probably the officer here described as ὁ εἰς τὴν ἀκτήν rather than ὁ ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν.

9. χηλῆς: this is a very tempting emendation, made by Mr. Torr, and based partly on Thuc. VIII. 90, where Eetioneia is described as χηλὴ τοῦ Πειραιῶς. On this theory χηλή would be the name of the north side of Piraeus, as ἀκτή is of the south. It must, however, be noted as an objection that the name is not found in any inscription or any other authority.

ραιεῖ· ἕνα δ' ἐπὶ τὰς συμ[μο]ρίας ὃς τούς τε τριηράρχους καταλέγει καὶ τὰς ἀντιδόσεις αὐτοῖς ποιεῖ καὶ τὰς διαδικασίας α[ὐτ]οῖς εἰσάγει· τοὺς δ' ἄλλους πρὸς τὰ παρόντα πράγματα ἐκπέμπουσιν.
2 *ἐπιχειροτονία δ' α[ὐ]τῶν ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν πρυτανείαν ἑκάστην, εἰ δοκοῦσιν καλῶς ἄρχειν· κἄν τινα ἀποχειροτον[ή]σωσιν, κρίνουσιν ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ, κἂν μὲν ἁλῷ, τιμῶσιν ὅ τι χρὴ παθεῖν ἢ ἀποτ[εῖσ]αι, ἂν δ' ἀποφύγῃ [πάλιν] ἄρχει. κύριοι δέ εἰσιν ὅταν ἡγῶνται καὶ δῆσαί τιν' ἀτακτοῦντα καὶ [κη]ρῦξαι*

12. *αὐτοῖς*: bracketed by K-W[2]. 13. *πράγματα*: added above the line in the MS., and therefore possibly an explanatory addition to the original text; expunged by H-L. 17. *ἁλῷ*: MS. *αλλωι*, with an *ω* above, which may be meant to take the place of *λω*. 18. *πάλιν*: so perhaps MS. as read by K-W. H-L. [*ἔτι*]. 19. *τιν'*: K-W. and H-L. *τόν*. *κηρῦξαι*: Blass *ἐκκηρῦξαι*, quoting Lys. III. 45, p. 100, and so H-L., K-W.; but there is not room for the preposition in the lacuna, and the remains of the first letter, which are visible, distinctly suggest *κ*.

10. *ἐπὶ τὰς συμμορίας*: this officer is mentioned in one of the documents collected by Boeckh in his *Urkunden über das Seewesen des Attischen Staates*, xiv a. 215, p. 465 (*C. I. A.* 809 a, 209), *τῷ στρατηγῷ τῷ ἐπὶ τὰς συμμορίας ᾑρημένῳ*.

12. *τοὺς δ' ἄλλους*: from the decrees in Demosthenes already quoted (*De Cor.* pp. 238, 265) Boeckh (corrected by Fraenkel, note to *Staatsh.*[3] I. 223) and Schömann gather that one of the strategi was known as *ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς διοικήσεως*. The officer there spoken of is not, however, actually called *στρατηγός*, and there is no evidence that such an officer ever existed. A *στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τὸ ναυτικόν* or *ἐπὶ τῶν νεῶν* is mentioned in a 3rd century inscription (*C. I. A.* II. 331) as existing at the end of the 4th century; and the same document also refers to *στρατηγοὶ ἐπὶ τὴν παρασκευήν* (*cf.* the much later *C. I. A.* II. 985) and *ἐπὶ τοὺς ξένους*.

14. *ἐπιχειροτονία δ' αὐτῶν ἐστὶ κ.τ.λ.*: *cf.* Pollux, VIII. 87, where he includes among the duties of the archons *στρατηγοὺς χειροτονεῖν ἐξ ἁπάντων καὶ καθ' ἑκάστην πρυτανείαν ἐπερωτᾶν εἰ δοκεῖ καλῶς ἄρχειν ἕκαστος· τὸν δ' ἀποχειροτονηθέντα κρίνουσι.*

19. *κηρῦξαι*: if this is the right reading (and it does not seem possible to read anything else), it must apparently mean that the general could publicly proclaim the name of any person misbehaving on military service or expel him with ignominy from the ranks. *Cf.* Lys. III. 45, where *ἐκκηρῦξαι* is used, though without further definition of its meaning.

καὶ ἐπιβολὴν ἐπιβάλλειν· οὐκ εἰώθασι δὲ ἐπιβάλλειν.
χειροτονοῦσι δὲ καὶ ταξ[ιά]ρχους δέκα, ἕνα τῆς 3
φυλῆς ἑκάστης· οὗτος δ' ἡγεῖται τῶν φυλετῶν καὶ
λοχαγοὺς καθίσ[τ]ησιν. χειροτονοῦσι δὲ καὶ ἱππάρ- 4
χους δύο ἐξ ἁπάντων· οὗτοι δ' ἡγοῦνται τῶν ἱππέων,
διελόμ[ενοι] τὰς φυλὰς ε̄ ἑκάτερος· κύριοι δὲ τῶν
αὐτῶν εἰσὶν ὧνπερ οἱ στρατηγοὶ κατὰ τῶν ὁπλι[τῶν.
ἐπιχειρο]τονία δὲ γίγνεται τούτων. χειροτονοῦσι δὲ 5
καὶ φυλάρχους, ἕνα τῆς φυλῆς, τὸν ἡγ[ησό]μενο[ν]
⟨τῶν ἱππέων⟩ ὥσπερ οἱ ταξίαρχοι τῶν ὁπλιτῶν.
χειροτονοῦσι δὲ καὶ εἰς Λῆμνον ἵππαρχον, ὃς ἐπι- 6

26. *εἰσὶν ὧνπερ*: MS. *ωνπερ* (not *ωσπερ*, as K-W. state) *εισιν*. *ὁπλιτῶν*: MS. *οπλειτων*. 27. *γίγνεται*: MS. *γινεται*. *τούτων*: Gertz, H-L., K-W. prefix *καί*, which would certainly be natural. 28. *φυλάρχους*: Sandys prefixes *δέκα*, K-W., H-L., Richards add it after this word, which would be its proper place. It is not absolutely necessary, but it would be in accordance with Aristotle's usage. 29. *τῶν ἱππέων*: om. MS.; *cf.* note below. *ὁπλιτῶν*: MS. *οπλειτων*.

23. *ἱππάρχους*: Harpocration quotes the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* for the number of these officers, and Photius says *δύο ἦσαν οἳ τῶν ἱππέων ἡγοῦντο διελόμενοι τὰς φυλὰς ἑκάτερος ἀνὰ πέντε. ἐπιμεληταὶ δέ εἰσι τῶν ἱππέων, καθάπερ οἱ ταξίαρχοι δέκα ὄντες, εἷς ἀφ' ἑκάστης φυλῆς, τῶν ὁπλιτῶν* (Rose, *Frag.* 391). Rose inserts *οἱ φύλαρχοι* after *ἱππέων* as subject of the second sentence, from Pollux VIII. 94, which is supported by the present passage; but probably the omission is on the part of Photius himself (and not his MSS.), and he has applied to the *ἵππαρχοι* a phrase which Aristotle attached to the *φύλαρχοι*. The way in which the number of the taxiarchs is mentioned appears to be intended to note a difference in that respect from the hipparchs who are otherwise compared with them.

28. *φυλάρχους*: Harpocration (*s.v.*), *φύλαρχός ἐστιν ὁ κατὰ φυλὴν ἑκάστην τοῦ ἱππικοῦ ἄρχων, ὑποτεταγμένος δὲ τῷ ἱππάρχῳ, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ φησί* (Rose, *Frag.* 392).

29. *τῶν ἱππέων*: it seems necessary to insert these words to complete the sense of the passage; and the insertion is confirmed by Pollux (VIII. 94), *οἱ δὲ φύλαρχοι δέκα, εἷς ἀπὸ τῆς φυλῆς ἑκάστης, τῶν ἱππέων προΐστανται, καθάπερ οἱ ταξίαρχοι τῶν ὁπλιτῶν.*

30. *εἰς Λῆμνον ἵππαρχον*: *cf.* Hyperides (*pro Lyc.* col. 14), *ὑμεῖς γὰρ ἐμέ . . πρῶτον μὲν φύλαρχον ἐχειροτονήσατε, ἔπειτα εἰς Λῆμνον ἵππαρχον,*

7 μ[ελ]εῖται τῶν ἱππέων τῶν ἐν Λήμνῳ. χειροτονοῦσι δὲ καὶ ταμίαν τῆς Παράλου καὶ ἄλλον τῆς [τοῦ Ἄ]μμωνος.

62. Αἱ δὲ κληρωταὶ ἀ[ρχ]αὶ πρότερον μὲν ἦσαν αἱ μὲν μετ' ἐννέα ἀρχόντων ἐ[κ] τῆς φυλῆς ὅλης

LXII. 2. μετ': Gennadios, H-L. μετὰ τῶν (μ̀τ').

καὶ ἦρξα μὲν αὐτόθι δύ' ἔτη τῶν πώποθ' ἱππαρχηκότων μόνος. *Cf.* also Demosthenes (*Phil.* I. § 27, p. 47), ἀλλ' εἰς μὲν Λῆμνον τὸν παρ' ὑμῶν ἵππαρχον δεῖν πλεῖν. Mr. Babington misunderstood the passage in Hyperides as meaning that one of the two hipparchs mentioned above was sent to Lemnos.

32. ταμίαν τῆς Παράλου κ.τ.λ.: Harpocration (*s. v.* ταμίας), after mentioning the ταμίαι τῆς θεοῦ and quoting Aristotle's Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία as his authority, adds εἰσὶ δέ τινες καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν τριήρων ταμίαι, ὡς ὁ αὐτὸς φιλόσοφός φησιν. The Lex. rhet. Cantabrig. (p. 675, 28) *s. v.* Πάραλος καὶ Σαλαμινία says, ταύτας τὰς τριήρεις εἶχον διὰ παντὸς πρὸς τὰς ἐπειγούσας ὑπηρεσίας, ἐφ' αἷς καὶ ταμίαι τινὲς ἐχειροτονοῦντο. . . . . τῆς μὲν Παράλου καὶ Σαλαμινίας ἐν τρίτῃ μνημονεύει Θουκυδίδης καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Ὄρνισιν, Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ Ἀμμωνιάδα καὶ Πάραλον οἶδε καὶ Δείναρχος ἐν τῷ κατὰ Τιμοκράτους. Φιλόχορος δὲ ἐν τῇ ς' τέτταρας αὐτὰς οἶδε, πρώτας μὲν δύο Ἀμμωνιάδα καὶ Πάραλον, προσγενομένας δὲ Δημητριάδα καὶ Ἀντιγονίδα. Photius (*s. v.* Πάραλοι) mentioning the Σαλαμινία says (according to the probable correction of the passage by Rose, ed. 1886) λέγεται δὲ ἡ αὐτὴ καὶ Ἀμμωνιάς, while *s. v.* ταμίαι, after mentioning the ταμίαι τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, he proceeds εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι ταμίαι, ἄρχοντες χειροτονητοὶ ἐπὶ τὰς ἱερὰς καὶ δημοσίας τριήρεις, ὁ μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν Πάραλον, ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ Ἄμμωνος. Harpocration (*s. v.* Ἀμμωνίς) says ἡ τοῦ Ἄμμωνος ἱερὰ τριήρης, and does not mention the Paralus or Salaminia. Finally the Lex. Demosth. Patm. (p. 150) and the scholiast on Demosth. p. 636 explain the name Ἀμμωνιάς as derived from the fact that the Athenians sent sacrifices to the god Ammon in it (Rose, *Fragg.* 402, 403, and 443 of ed. 1886). From all this it appears that the two original sacred triremes were the Paralus and Salaminia, and that the latter was re-named (or replaced by) the Ammonias. This is not likely to have happened before the time of Alexander, and the occurrence of the name here is another sign of this treatise having been written in the later years of the life of Aristotle.

LXII. 2. αἱ μὲν μετ' ἐννέα ἀρχόντων: there does not appear to be anything to show what offices are included under this head except the archons and their secretary, but presumably all the various boards of ten would fall into this class.

κληρούμεναι, αἱ δ' ἐν Θησείῳ κληρούμεναι διῃροῦντο εἰς τοὺς δήμ[ο]υς· ἐπειδὴ δ' ἐπώλουν οἱ δῆμοι, καὶ ταύτας ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς ὅλης κληροῦσι πλὴν βουλευτῶν καὶ φρουρῶν· τούτους δ' εἰς τοὺς δ[ημότ]ας ἀποδιδόασι. μισθοφοροῦσι δὲ πρῶτον [μὲν ὁ δῆμος] ταῖς 2

3. *διῃροῦντο*: Gertz, H-L. prefix *αἱ*.

3. *αἱ δ' ἐν Θησείῳ κληρούμεναι*: that this phrase means 'the officers who *are now* elected by lot in the Theseum' appears not only from the tense of the participle but from a passage in Aeschines (*contr. Ctes.* § 13, p. 55), in which all magistracies (*ἀρχαί*) are divided into those *ἃς οἱ θεσμοθέται ἀποκληροῦσιν ἐν τῷ Θησείῳ*, and those *ἃς ὁ δῆμος εἴωθε χειροτονεῖν ἐν ἀρχαιρεσίαις*. The elections of the archons and their secretary, which had never been committed to the demes, were held in some place which does not seem to be recorded anywhere; while those which were originally entrusted to the demes were, when they were taken out of their hands, held in the Theseum.

διῃροῦντο εἰς τοὺς δήμους: *i.e.* the election was committed to the several demes, until these bodies proved themselves too corrupt. What offices are included under this head we cannot tell, but they can only have been of very minor importance. The very numerous boards of ten, of which one representative was taken from each tribe, can only have been elected by the tribes collectively; unless we are to suppose a process of preliminary selection of candidates by the demes to have taken place. Such a process of preliminary selection took place in reference to the archons, though probably not through the demes; *cf.* ch. 8, l. 4 and 22, l. 28, and note on latter place.

5. *πλὴν βουλευτῶν*: this throws a fresh light on the election of the members of the Council. The number of members elected by a deme must have varied from time to time. In Aristotle's time there cannot have been less than 150 demes, or an average of fifteen in each tribe; and among these fifteen the election of the fifty representatives of the tribe must have been divided, probably in proportion to the population of the demes.

6. *φρουρῶν*: presumably the 500 *φρουροὶ νεωρίων* mentioned in conjunction with the *βουλευταί* in ch. 24, l. 18.

7. *μισθοφοροῦσι δὲ κ.τ.λ.*: one would certainly expect the first item of pay to be that of the ecclesiastae, which would naturally be combined with that for service in the law-courts and in the Council. But the amount named is much more than we ever hear of elsewhere as having been paid for attendance at the assembly. Aristotle has already (ch. 41) mentioned the institution of pay for this service and its

μὲν ἄλλαις ἐκκλησίαις δραχμήν, τῇ δὲ κυρίᾳ ἐννέα· ἔπειτα τὰ δικ[αστήρια] τρεῖς ὀβολούς· εἶθ' ἡ βουλὴ πέντε ὀβολούς. τοῖς δὲ πρυτανεύουσιν εἰς σίτησιν

8. ἐννέα: H-L., K-W. add ὀβολούς.

extension from one to three obols, but without any sign of its having ever been increased beyond that sum. That was unquestionably its amount at the date of the *Ecclesiazusae* of Aristophanes (392 B.C.), and there is no sign in any of the grammarians of a later increase. The only other pay in connexion with the ecclesia was that of the συνήγοροι or advocates employed on the public service. This, according to Aristophanes (*Wasps* 691) and the scholiast on that passage, amounted to a drachma, but it is hardly likely that this is the payment referred to here; for one thing, there is not room for the word in the lacuna, and on every other ground than that of the sum named one would prefer to supply ὁ δῆμος. In the great increase of national corruption and pleasure-seeking which characterised the fourth century, it is not at all impossible that some demagogue proposed that the pay for service in the ecclesia should be doubled, and it is highly probable that such a proposal would have been accepted by that body.

8. ἐννέα: *sc.* ὀβολούς, *i.e.* a drachma and a half. H-L. and K-W. insert the word in the text.

9. τὰ δικαστήρια τρεῖς ὀβολούς: the institution by Pericles of pay for services in the law-courts is mentioned in ch. 27, l. 28, but the amount is not named. There is a quotation of Aristotle by a scholiast on Aristophanes (*Wasps* 684) which may be partly referred to the present passage: τοὺς τρεῖς ὀβολούς· τὸν φόρον λέγει, ἀφ' ὧν ἐδίδοτο τὸ τριώβολον. τοῦτο δὲ ἄλλοτε ἄλλως ἐδίδοτο, τῶν δημαγωγῶν τὰ πλήθη κολακευόντων, ὥς φησιν Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν πολιτείαις (Rose, *Frag.* 421). Aristotle does not, in the extant part of his treatise, connect the pay for service in the courts with the competition of the demagogues, though he speaks of the latter in general terms (ch. 27, 28); but it is quite possible that he may have had occasion to do so in dealing with the procedure in the courts, in which case the passage is now lost. Hesychius (*s. v.* δικαστήριον) uses the same phrase about the variation of the rate of pay, ἄλλοτε ἄλλως ἐδίδοτο. In the passage of Pollux (VIII. 113) also quoted by Rose, in which there is mention of varying payments of three obols, two obols, and one obol, it is not certain whether this refers to τὸ δικαστικόν alone, or to τὸ θεωρικόν and τὸ ἐκκλησιαστικόν as well.

10. πέντε ὀβολούς: Hesychius (*s.v.* βουλῆς λαχεῖν) states that the members of the Council received a drachma a day, but there is not much difference between that sum and the five obols mentioned by Aristotle, and the latter is most likely to be correct.

[ὀβολὸς π]ροστίθεται† δέκα προστίθενται †. ἔπειτ' εἰς σίτησιν λαμβάνουσιν ἐνν[έα ἄρχον]τες τέττα[ρας] ὀβολοὺς ἕκαστος καὶ παρατρέφουσι κήρυκα καὶ

11. *ὀβολός*: supplied by Blass, who also points out that the corrupt *δέκα προστίθενται* probably arose from a misunderstanding of the sign I, which = *ὀβολός*, but which was read as *ι*, = *δέκα*. H-L., Rutherford, *εἷς ὀβολός*, which is possible if *εἷς* was represented by a numeral. 12. *ἐννέα*: Gennadios, H-L. prefix *οἱ*, but *cf.* l. 2.

12. *ἄρχοντες*: that this is the proper word to fill the lacuna in the MS., in spite of the omission of the article before *ἐννέα* (which occurs again in l. 2 of this chapter), is indicated by the mention of the *κῆρυξ* and *αὐλητής* (see following note). In spite of its mutilated condition, this chapter does much to clear up the question of the payment of the Athenian officials. It makes it clear that several of the magistrates received payment, which is contrary to the view that has been generally held. It is, for instance, directly stated by Schömann that the magistrates (*ἄρχοντες*, or holders of *ἀρχαί*), as well as most of the *ἐπιμεληταί*, served without pay (*Ant. of Greece*, Eng. Tr. pp. 401, 402; *Ant. Jur. Publ.*, p. 237); but he gives no authorities for his statement. On the other side we have more than one passage of the present treatise. In ch. 24, l. 20, among the various services for which the populace of Athens received pay, and thereby supported itself in the city, are the *ἀρχαὶ ἔνδημοι* to the number of seven hundred, which must apparently include all magistracies, great and small. In ch. 29, l. 38 one of the first provisions of the board of Thirty which was established in 411 B.C. to draw up the new constitution was *τὰς ἀρχὰς ἀμίσθους ἄρχειν ἁπάσας ἕως ὁ πόλεμος ᾖ, πλὴν τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων καὶ τῶν πρυτανέων οἳ ἂν ὦσιν, τούτους δὲ φέρειν τρεῖς ὀβολοὺς ἕκαστον τῆς ἡμέρας.* This clearly shows that up to that time both the magistrates named and others who are not named received pay. Finally there is the present passage, which, though mutilated, seems to indicate that the pay of the archons was four obols a day; and this agrees well enough with the passage in ch. 29, since it is not unnatural that when all other officers were being deprived of their remuneration those who still received it should have it reduced. At what date pay was introduced for these magistracies we cannot say, except that it must have been between about 470 B.C. and 411 B.C.; nor can we say whether this rule applied to all magistrates, and, if not, to which of them. It seems practically certain, however, that it applied to the archons.

13. *κήρυκα καὶ αὐλητήν*: a *κῆρυξ τῷ ἄρχοντι* and an *αὐλητής* are mentioned side by side in two inscriptions (*C. I. G.* 181, 182), and it is probable that these are the officials here referred to.

αὐλητήν· ἔπειτ' ἄρχων [εἰς Σαλα]μῖνα δραχ[μὴν] τῆς
ἡμέρας. ἀθλοθέται δ' ἐν πρυτανείῳ δειπνοῦσι τὸν
Ἑκ[ατομβ]αιῶνα μῆνα ὅ[τ]αν ᾖ τὰ Παναθήναια, ἀρ-
ξάμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς τετράδος ἱσταμένου. Ἀμ[φι]κτύονες
εἰς Δῆλον δραχμὴν τῆς ἡμέρας ἑκάστης ἐκ Δήλου
⟨λαμβάνουσι⟩. λαμβάνουσι δὲ καὶ ὅσαι ἀπο-
στέλλονται ἀρχαὶ εἰς Σάμον ἢ Σκῦρον ἢ Λῆμνον ἢ
3 Ἴμβρον εἰς σίτησιν ἀργύριον. ἄρχειν δὲ τὰς μὲν
κατὰ πόλεμον ἀρχὰς ἔ[ξεσ]τι πλεονάκις, τῶν δ'
ἄλλων οὐδεμίαν, πλὴν βουλεῦσαι δίς.

63. Τὰ δὲ δικαστήρια [κ]λη[ροῦσιν] οἱ θ̄ ἄρ-
[χο]ντες κατὰ φυλάς, ὁ δὲ γραμματεὺς τῶν θεσμο-
2 [θετῶν τῆς] δεκάτης φυλῆς. εἴσοδοι δέ εἰσιν εἰς τὰ
δικασ[τή]ρια δέκα, μία τῇ φυλῇ ἑκάστῃ, καὶ κλη[ρω-
τήρια] εἴκοσι, δ[ύο τῇ] φυλῇ ἑκάστῃ, καὶ κιβώτια
ἑκατόν, δέκα τῇ φυλῇ ἑκάστῃ, καὶ ἕτερα κιβώτι[α
δέκα, οἷς ἐ]μβάλλεται τῶν λαχόντων δικα[σ]τῶν τὰ

15. πρυτανείῳ: H-L. prefix τῷ. δειπνοῦσι: MS. διπνουσι. 16. ὅταν: so K-W., apparently rightly; 1st ed. and H-L. ᾧ ἄν. 19. λαμβάνουσι: om. MS., owing to the repetition of the word immediately afterwards. LXIII. 1. τὰ δέ: MS. τα δε τα. 3. Before τῆς H-L. insert τούς.

14. ἄρχων εἰς Σαλαμῖνα: this is the officer mentioned in ch. 54, l. 40.

LXIII. 1. Τὰ δὲ δικαστήρια: a detailed account of the procedure in the law-courts begins here, but unfortunately the greater part of it is lost, or exists only in such a state that it is hopeless to decipher the remains into a connected narrative. We have here the description of the first part of the procedure in the assignment of the jurors to the several courts, and the fragments which remain of the rest of the treatise show that the same detailed scale was preserved throughout this part of the work. Some points in the description are already known from the scattered statements of orators and grammarians. These notices are fully treated of by Meier (*Attische Process*, II. 1), and from him in the various dictionaries of antiquities, but the hitherto received views receive correction and amplification from the new material.

π[ινά]κια, καὶ ὑδρίαι δύο· καὶ βακτηρίαι παρατίθενται κατὰ τὴν ε[ἴσοδον] ἑκάστην ὅσοιπερ οἱ δικα[σ]ταί, καὶ βάλανοι εἰς τὴν ὑδρίαν ἐμβάλλονται ἴσαι ταῖς βακτηρίαις. [γ]έγραπται δὲ ἐν ταῖς βαλάνοις τῶν στοιχείων ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑνδεκάτου, τοῦ λ, ὅσαπερ ἂν

8. *βακτηρίαι*: MS. *βακτηρια*. 9. *ὅσοιπερ*: MS. *ουσοιπερ*. 10. *ἴσαι*: in the MS. a *σ* has been written before this word, but has been struck out. 11. *τῶν στοιχείων*: so read by Blass, apparently rightly; 1st ed., K-W., H-L. [*τὰ*] *στοιχεῖα*. 12. *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑνδεκάτου, τοῦ λ*: MS. at first *απο του ενδεκατου του τριακοστου*, but *του τριακοστου* is struck out, and above it is written *του λ· τριακοστου·*. H-L., after Rutherford, remove *τοῦ ἑνδεκάτου* as well as *τριακοστοῦ*. *ἂν*: MS. *εαν*.

11. *τῶν στοιχείων ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑνδεκάτου*: the text has been confused in the MS., but the meaning is clear. The reason for the corrupt insertion of *τριακοστοῦ* in the text is simply that λ is the numeral representing 30, and some person, misunderstanding the passage, thought that the letter was here used in its numeral capacity and added the number in words in the margin or above the line, from which it became incorporated in the text. Aristotle is simply stating that in one of the urns used in the process of selecting by lot the bodies that were to sit in the several courts were placed tablets, equal in number to the dicasts required on the day in question, and lettered from λ (the eleventh letter in the alphabet) upwards. The reason for beginning with λ is that the first ten letters, from *α* to *κ*, were already used to distinguish the ten groups into which the whole heliastic body was divided. Accordingly when the casting of lots took place the letters from *α* to *κ* indicated the ten groups of jurors, and the letters from λ to *υ* (or less, if not all the ten courts were required) the courts in which they were to sit. The process of sortition described in this chapter and the first column of the fragments which follow is sufficiently intricate. It is first observable that nothing is said of a total heliastic body of 6000, nor of groups of 500 each, with 1000 in reserve. Nor is it stated that the jurors were selected by lot annually. On the contrary it appears that all citizens over 30 years of age and not labouring under any special disability were entitled to serve; that they were divided into ten groups, distinguished by the letters *α* to *κ*, and containing approximately an equal number of representatives of each tribe; and that the selection of the dicasts who should sit on any given occasion was decided by a process of sortition conducted for each tribe by its archon (or, in the case of the tenth, by the secretary to the archons). It is perhaps due to the mutilated state of the MS. that the precise use of the groups is not clear. For it appears that the

3 μέλλῃ [τ]ὰ δικαστήρια πληρωθήσεσθαι. δικάζειν δ'
ἔξεστιν τοῖς ὑπὲρ λ ἔτη γεγονόσιν, ὅσοι αὐτῶν [μ]ὴ
ὀφείλουσιν τῷ δημοσίῳ ἢ ἄτιμοί εἰσιν· ἐὰν δέ τις
δικάζῃ οἷς μὴ ἔξεστιν, ἐνδείκνυται καὶ [εἰς] τὸ δικασ-
τήριον εἰσάγετ[αι], ἐὰν δ' ἁλῷ προστιμ[ῶσιν αὐτ]ῷ
οἱ δικασταὶ ὅ τι ἂν δοκῇ ἄξιος εἶναι παθε[ῖν] ἢ
ἀποτεῖσαι. ἐὰν δὲ ἀργυρίου τιμηθῇ δεῖ αὐτὸν δε-
δέ[σθαι] ἕως ἂν ἐκτείσῃ τό τε πρότερον ὄφλημ[α
ἐ]φ' ᾧ ἐνεδείχθη καὶ ὅ τι ἂν αὐτῷ προστιμήσῃ τ[ὸ
4 δικ]αστήριον. ἔχει δ' ἕκαστος δικαστὴς πινάκιον
πύξινον, ἐπιγεγραμμένον τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἑαυτοῦ πα-
τρόθεν καὶ τοῦ δήμου καὶ γράμ[μα] ἓν τῶν στοιχείων
μέχρι τοῦ κ· νενέμηνται γὰρ κατὰ φυλὰς δέκα μέρη

14. ὅσοι: MS. at first ισοι, but corrected. 16. οἷς: H-L. ᾧ, after Richards. καὶ . . . εἰσάγεται: so MS.; 1st ed. κατὰ τὸ δικαστήριον εἰσαγγελία, which is followed by H-L. with the substitution of εἰσαγγελίᾳ, after Fraenkel. 19, 20. ἀποτεῖσαι . . . ἐκτείσῃ: MS. αποτισαι . . . εκτισῃ. 22. πινάκιον: there is a lacuna before this word sufficient to contain two letters, but it does not appear that anything is wanting to complete the sense. If anything was written it was probably struck out. 23. ἑαυτοῦ: H-L. τ' αὐτοῦ.

members of them did not act *en bloc*, as has been supposed, but that the requisite number of dicasts was first chosen by lot from each tribe (col. 31, ll. 20–24), and that then the selected persons drew tablets bearing the distinguishing letters of the courts, which showed in which court they were to sit that day (ll. 25–35). Then each dicast received a staff bearing the distinguishing colour of the court assigned to him (col. 32, ll. 3–13), and, on entering the court, a σύμβολον (ll. 13–15), which ultimately served as the voucher entitling him to receive his day's pay. Some points still remain to be cleared up, and the whole subject requires detailed re-investigation by bringing the various references in Aristophanes and the orators into connection with the present passage.

25. νενέμηνται γὰρ κατὰ φυλὰς δέκα μέρη κ.τ.λ.: this does not mean that each group consisted of members of a single tribe, which is inconsistent with all the evidence we have on the subject and is disproved by the existing πινάκια or dicast's tickets, of which a considerable number have been found in recent years, and on which members of different tribes appear as belonging to the same group. The meaning is, on

οἱ δικασταί, παραπλ[ησί]ως ἴσοι ἐν ἑκάστῳ τῷ γράμ[μα]τι. ἐπειδὰν δὲ ὁ θεσμοθέτης ἐπικληρώσῃ τὰ γρ[άμ]ματα ἃ δεῖ προσπαρατίθεσθαι τοῖς δικαστηρίοις, ἐπέθηκε φέρων ὁ ὑπηρέτης ἐφ᾽ ἕκαστ[ον δικ]αστήριον τὸ γράμμα τὸ λαχόν.

28. προσπαρατίθεσθαι: so rightly read by Blass; 1st ed., K-W., H-L. προσπαραγίνεσθαι.

the contrary, that each group contained, roughly speaking, an equal number of representatives from each of the ten tribes.

30. τὸ λαχόν: the MS. breaks off here with all the appearance of having reached the conclusion of the work, as it is neither the end of a column nor the end of a line, and a slight flourish is made below the last words. But clearly the author is only in the middle of his subject, and there are moreover several fragments (Nos. 423–426) which obviously belong to this description of the procedure of the δικαστήρια. The rest of the work was evidently written on a portion of papyrus of which several fragments remain, but unfortunately in a condition which makes continuous decipherment hopeless. They are written in the 'third hand' of the MS., which explains why the text breaks off here in the middle of a column. The writer of the 'fourth hand' left off transcribing at this point, and when his colleague or servant took it up he began a fresh column. Moreover it is clear, from an inspection of the writing on the *recto* of these fragments, that he began a fresh piece of papyrus. The writing on the *recto* of the piece which ends here contains the accounts of the end of Pharmouthi and the greater part of Pachon for the eleventh year of Vespasian; while the accounts on the *recto* of the fragments belong to the end of Phamenoth and the greater part of Pharmouthi (both the beginning and the end remain, but the middle is lost and the whole mutilated) of the *tenth* year. It is therefore clear that an earlier portion of the same collection of accounts was taken in order to receive on its *verso* the conclusion of Aristotle's work. Enough is legible to show that these fragments are a continuation of this part of the text, and to identify all but one of the quotations referred to above as belonging to this part of the work. The text is subjoined so far as it is legible; but it will be seen that, with the exception of the concluding sentences of the work and most of the first column, with those places where the extant quotations assist us, it is impossible to restore it to a state of continuity without an unjustifiable use of conjectural emendation.

FRAGMENTS.

[Τ]ὰ δὲ . . . . [Col. 31.]
προσθεν . . . [κ]αθ' ἑκάστην τὴ[ν φυ]-
λήν. ἐπιγέ[γραπται δ'] ἐπ' αὐτῶν τὰ στο[ι]-
χεῖα μέχρι τ[οῦ κ· ἐπ]ειδὰν δ' ἐμβάλωσιν [τῶ]-

2. προσθεν . . .: the letters θεν are doubtful. 4. ἐμβάλωσιν: so apparently, as a correction of βλαβωσιν.

COL. 31. In the first edition only a slight attempt was made to restore this portion of the MS., and as in many places the letters can only be read with confidence after the sense of the passage has been divined, the readings there given required correction in several places. The task of restoration has been independently undertaken by Prof. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, by M. Haussoullier (*Rev. de Philologie*, April, 1891), and, in part, by Dr. Sandys. These restorations, made independently in the first instance from the facsimile, were subsequently compared with the original; and the results are now taken as the basis of the present text. Professors van Herwerden and van Leeuwen drew up yet another independent restoration from the facsimile, without reference to the original MS.

1. Τὰ δέ: these are the first words visible on the fragments which now represent what was originally the last roll of the MS. A few letters are visible to the left of this column, but it is not quite certain that they belong to this MS., and the width of the margin, with the fact that the beginning of this part of the papyrus corresponds with a break in the series of accounts on the other side of it, favours the idea that this is the beginning of the fourth roll. Moreover the subject here under discussion is closely connected with that with which the third roll ends. The first column, which is fairly complete, is followed by two of which there are considerable remains, two which are almost entirely lost or illegible, and two which contain the conclusion of the work, the last one (which consists of only eight lines of writing) being alone in good condition. It seems useless to divide this very fragmentary text into chapters, especially as it is all concerned with one subject, and the numbers of the columns afford sufficient means of reference.

ν δικαστ[ῶ]ν τ[ὰ πινάκ]ια εἰς τὸ κιβώτι[ον] ·ἐφ' οὗ ἂν ᾖ ἐπι[γεγρα]μμένον τὸ γράμ[μα] τὸ αὐτὸ ὅπ[ε]ρ ἐ[πὶ τῷ π]ινακίῳ ἐστὶν ἀ[πὸ] τῶν στοιχείω[ν] . . . σείσαντος τοῦ ὑ[πη]ρέτου ἕλκει ὁ [θεσμο]θέτης ἐξ ἑκάστου τοῦ κιβωτίο[υ πινά]κιον ἕν. οὗτος δὲ καλεῖ[τ]αι ἐμ[πήκτη]ς, καὶ ἐμπήγνυσι τὰ πινάκια [τὰ ἐκ το]ῦ κιβωτίου εἰς τὴν κανονίδα [ἐφ' ἧς τὸ α]ὐτὸ γράμμα ἔπεστιν ὅπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ [κιβωτίου. κληροῦται δ'] οὗτος ἵνα μὴ ἀεὶ ὁ αὐτὸς ἐμπ[ήκτης ὢν] κακουργῇ. εἰσὶ δὲ κανονίδες [δέκα ἐ]ν ἑκάστῳ τῶν κληρωτηρίων. [ἐπειδὰν δ'] ἐμβάλῃ τοὺς κύβους ὁ ἄρχων τὴν φυλὴν κα[λεῖ εἰς τὸ κ]ληρωτήριον. εἰσὶ δὲ κύβοι χα[λκοῖ, μέ]λανες καὶ λευκοί. ὅσους δ' ἂν δέ[ῃ ἑκάστοτε] δικαστάς, τοσοῦτοι ἐμβάλλον[ται λευ]κοὶ κατὰ πέντε πινάκια εἷς, [οἱ δὲ μέλ]ανες τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον. ἐπειδὰν δ' ἐ[ξέλῃ] τοὺς κύβους καλεῖ τοὺς εἰληχότας ὁ [ἄρχων]· ὑπάρχει δὲ καὶ ὁ ἐμ-

5. K-W. read the first letter as *τι*, which they take as a misspelling of the first letters of *δικαστῶν*; but it certainly appears to be *ν*. 8. . . . *σείσαντος*: Haussoullier, H-L. *διασείσαντος*. 11. MS. *ενπηκτης* and *ενπηγνυσι*. 13. *κανονίδα*: corrected from *κανωνίδα*, and so again below, l. 16, *κανονίδες*. *ἧς*: K-W. *ᾗ*, but the phrase in the next line supports the genitive. 14. *κληροῦται* must have been written above the line, as the lacuna will not hold more than *κιβωτίου*. There is a trace of writing above the line just before the lacuna commences. 15. *ἐμπήκτης ὤν*: MS. *ενπ-*, K-W. *ἐνπηγνύων*. 17. *τοὺς κύβους*: added above the line. 19. *χαλκοῖ*: the visible remains suggest *χα-*, rather than *ξύλινοι* (K-W.), *λίθοι* (Haussoullier), or *πολλοί* (H-L.). 20. *ἑκάστοτε*: K-W. *εἶναι*. 24. *ἄρχων*: 1st ed., Haussoullier, H-L. *ὑπηρέτης*, but the space seems against this.

πήκτης εἰς τὸν [τόπο]ν. ὁ δὲ κληθεὶς καὶ
. . . . ἕλκει [βάλανο]ν ἐκ τῆς ὑδρίας
καὶ . ρο . ξας αὐτὴ[ν] . . . ων τὸ γράμμα δ[εί]-
κνυσιν πρῶτ[ον μὲν] τῷ ἄρχοντι τῷ ἐ[φ]εσ-
τηκότι, ὁ δὲ [ἄρχων ἐπειδὰ]ν ἴδῃ ἐμβάλλει τὸ
πινάκιον α[ὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ κ]ιβώτιον ὅπου
ἂν ᾖ ἐπιγεγραμ[μέν]ον τὸ αὐτὸ στοιχεῖ-
ον ὅπερ ἐν τῇ βαλ[άνῳ, ἵ]ν' εἰς οἷον ἂν λάχῃ
εἰσίῃ καὶ μὴ εἰς ο[ἷον] ἂν βούληται, μηδὲ [ἐν]-
ῇ συνάγειν [εἰς τὸ] δικαστήριον οὓς ἂν
βούληταί τις. π[αράκει]ται δὲ τῷ ἄρχοντι κι-
βώτια ὅσ' ἂν ἀεὶ [μ]έλλῃ τὰ δικαστήρια
πληρωθήσεσθαι [ἔχο]ντα στοιχεῖον ἕ-
καστον ὅπερ ἂ[ν ᾖ] τοῦ δικαστηρίου ἑκάσ-
[του] . ειχ . . . . [Col. 32.]
[ὑ]πηρέτῃ ει . . . .
. ος ὁ δὲ ὑπηρ[έτης] . . . . [βακ]τηρίαν
[ὁ]μόχρων τῷ [δ]ικα[στηρίῳ] . . . .
γράμμα
[ὅ]περ ἐν τῇ βαλάνῳ ι . . . . καιον ην αὐτῷ
[ε]ἰσελθεῖν εἰς τ[ὸ ἑ]αυ[τοῦ δικαστ]ήριον· ἐὰν γὰρ
[ε]ἰς ἕτερον εἰ[σίῃ, ἐξελέγχεται ὑπὸ τοῦ] χρώμα-
[τ]ο[ς τ]ῆς βακτηρίας. [τοῖς γὰρ δικαστηρ]ίοις χρώ-

25. *τόν*: the reading is uncertain, especially the first two letters. 26. *ἕλκει* is not certain. 29. MS. *ενβαλλει*. 30. *ὅπου*: before this word *οτι* has been written, but it is struck out. 33. It is uncertain whether any letters were written after *μηδέ*. Haussoullier gives *ἐξ-*. 34. *συνάγειν*: so apparently corrected in MS. from *συναγαγειν*. 37. *ἔχοντα*: corrected in MS. from *εχοντας*.

COL. 32. The restorations in this column (except ll. 8–15) are chiefly due to Prof. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff.

8. *τοῖς γὰρ δικαστηρίοις κ.τ.λ.*: this passage is quoted verbally by the scholiast on Aristoph. *Plut.* 278, who introduces it with the words, *περὶ τοῦ παραδιδομένου τοῖς εἰσιοῦσιν εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον συμβόλου 'Αρισ-*

[μ]α[τ]α ἐπιγέγραπτ[αι ἐφ' ἑκάστῳ] ἐπὶ τῷ σφη-
[κ]ίσκῳ τῆς εἰσ[όδ]ου· [ὁ δὲ λαβὼν τὴν] βακτηρί-
[αν] βαδίζει εἰς [τὸ] δικα[στήριον τὸ] ὁμόχρων
μὲν τῇ βακτ[ηρί]ᾳ ἔ[χον δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ] γράμμα
[ὅπερ] ἐν τῇ βαλάνῳ. ἐπ[ειδὰν δὲ εἰσέλθῃ], παραλαμ-
βάνει σύμβολον δη[μοσίᾳ] παρὰ τοῦ εἰλη-
[χό]τος ταύτην τὴν ἀ[ρχήν]. . τα . ην τα . . .
. . . τὴν βακτηρίαν . . . . . ρα . . . της . . .
. . . . τρόπον . . . ε . . . . . . τες τοῖς . . . .
. . . . ους . . . . το δι . . . . . οι κ . . περ . κ .
. . πινάκια οἱ δὲ ὑπηρέται δημοσίᾳ
[τῆ]ς φυλῆς ἑκάστης ἀ[ποδι]δόασιν τὰ κ[ι]-
[β]ώτια, ἓν ἐπὶ τὸ δικα[στήρ]ιον ἕκαστον . .
. . . ἐστὶν τὰ . . . . α . [τῆς] φυλῆς τὰ ὄντ[α]
ἐν ἑκάστῳ τῶν δικα[στηρί]ων, παραδιδόα[σι]
δὲ τοῖς εἰληχ[όσιν] παρα[δι]δόναι τοῖς δικ[ασ]-
ταῖς ἑκάστῳ . . . α . . [τ]ῷ ἀριθμῷ τ . .
παρὰ τῷ α . . . τούτου . . . . . υν . . . ς ἀπο[δί]-
δωσι τὸν [μισ]θὸν . . . . . δὲ πάντα . . .
κατὰ δικαστήρια τρ . . . . . εν τω . . . . . . ν
δικαστήρ[ι]ο[ν] . . . . ια καὶ . . . . κ
ειν εἶτ' ἐπὶ τὰ . . . ται . . . . . ε . . . . καὶ . . . . . .
καὶ ἕτεροι κύ[βο]ι ἐν οἷ[ς] . . τῶν ἀρ[χ]ῶν τ . . . .

COL. 32. 9. χρώματα: K-W. restore χρῶμα from the Schol. on Ar. *Plut.* 278, and delete ἐφ', for which they think there is not space enough. 19. οἱ δὲ ὑπηρέται: so read, apparently rightly, by Blass. 20, 21. τὰ κιβώτια: this reading is also due to Blass.

τοτέλης ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ οὕτω γράφει (Rose, *Frag.* 420). In the scholium χρῶμα is read instead of χρώματα, and a lacuna is indicated between it and ἐπιγέγραπται, which Dindorf fills up with a whole clause; but according to this MS. nothing can be lost except the syllable τα, and even that is not absolutely certain.

τῷ ε . . . . ξ . . ετα . . . . το . . . τῶν [θεσμο]-
θετῶν . . . . [ο]υς τοὺς κύ[βους]
βάλλουσιν ὁ πεντ . . . . [δικασ]-
τήριον ὁ δὲ τῶν ἀρχ[όντ]ων . . . .
. . . δαν . . . τη α . . . . ν ἀρχῶν . . . .
. . . . κηρυ . . . .

[ἀ]ρχῶν τ . . . . [Col. 33.]
. ευτερ . . . .
. εμια . . σι . . . .
. αν λα . . . .
. ως . . . .
. ται ἡ ἀρχὴ . . . . [δικα]-
[σ]τηρίῳ ἑκάστῳ . . . .
τιου πινάκιον . . . . [ἑ]-
κάστης τῆς . . . . . .
ἕτερον κενὸν . . . . . .
τοὺς πρώτους . . . . . .
δωρ τέτταρας . . . .
μηδεὶς παρὰ . . . . . .
ὕδωρ μήτε . . . .
. . ητα . . αρεσ . . . .

COL. 33. 6. *ται ἡ ἀρχή*: K-W. *τας παραλ-*, which is possible. 12 This reading is that of K-W. which is doubtful but probable.

COL. 33. Of this column only a strip remains, containing the beginnings of the lines; and even this is considerably rubbed, so that it is not possible to obtain any connected sense out of it. Under these circumstances, it does not seem advisable to go too far in the way of printing doubtful letters to which no sense can be attached. The last five lines of the column are completely illegible. K-W. print another fragment with this column, distinguishing it as *b*; but there is nothing to show that this is its place. It contains the ends of some lines, and these are rarely reconcilable with the beginnings to which they are attached.

. . . . . . *λαχοντ* . . . . .
ἀπολαμβάνο[*υσι*] . . . . . .
τὸν μισθὸν . . . .
ται αἱ φυλαὶ . . . . [*ἐπει*]-
δὰν δικάσωσ[*ι*] . . . . . .
δια τα τον . . . .
τοῦτο συν . . . . . .
ταῦτα ὑπὸ . . . . . .
ὅταν μὲν . . . .
τῷ ἀριθμ[*ῷ*] . . . .
. . *τοῦ νόμο*[*υ*] . . . .
εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ π . . . . [*βα*]-
σιλεύς . . . . . .
. . *σι* . *εἰσὶ δ*[*ὲ*] . . . . . .
. . *ρους* . . . .
. . *τας* . . . .
. . . .
. . . .
. . . .
. . . .
. . . .

[Col. 34.]

(1)

καστοι . . .
πευδοι . . .
θειν τους . . .
λαμβα . . .
ρος τοῖς δ . .
ἐν δὲ τοῖς . .
. ωι διαφ . . .
[ἐ]πὶ τοῖς . . .
[ἔ]στι δὲ σ . .
[χ]ρήματ . . .
ἀπὸ τῆ[ς] . . .

(2)

. . . και ο π . . .
. . . στηρ . .
. . . τες . . .
. . . μητε . . .
. . . ενοχ . . .
. . . ουσι τε . . .
. . . τους . . .
. . . ν δικ . . .
. . . ναι . . .

(3)

να . . .
ημαρ . . .
ναπ . . .
μετρη . . .
[ε]πιλαμβ . . .
τω τε κα . . .
διαμε . . .
δεωνος . . .
χρωντ . .

(4)

. . . . . ν . ν
. . . . . λ . .
. . . . . [το]ὺς . . δας
. . . . . . ἰδίους
. . . . . . ων τ[ω]ν
. . . . . λ . . . οι
. . . . . δε τα δημο
. . . . . κ δικ . . .
. . . . . χους . . .
. . . . . ς ο δεῖ . τοῦ
. . . . . εις υ . . . περ
. . . . . ἑπτάχους δὲ
. . . . . ων καὶ δίχους
. . . . καὶ δίχους ἑξάχους
. . . . . ερον λόγος ου ως
. . . . . ως ἐπιλαμβάνει

Col. 34. A few detached fragments are given here which belong either to this column or to those which immediately precede and

[Col. 35.] *εστι . . . . αν*
δεδε . . . . ειν
συν . . . . ενην μεν
τα ν . . . .
τριε . . . [ψῆφοι δέ εἰσι χαλκαῖ] αὐλίσ-
κον [ἔχουσαι ἐν τῷ μέσῳ, αἱ μὲν ἡ]μίσειαι τε-
τρυ[πημέναι αἱ δὲ ἡμίσειαι πλήρεις. οἱ] δὲ λα-
χόντες [ἐπὶ τὰς ψήφους, ἐπειδὰν εἰρημέ]νοι
ὦσιν [οἱ λόγοι, παραδιδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τ]ῶν
δικαστ[ῶν δύο ψήφους, τετρυπημένη]ν καὶ

follow it. The size of this portion of the papyrus is estimated from the writing which is on the other side of it, from which it may be gathered that not more than one column is required between that which has just been given and that which follows as col. 35. The first fragment consists of the beginnings of lines, and must therefore belong to either col. 34 or col. 35. The second contains the middles of lines, and may therefore be placed anywhere in columns 33–35. The third has been ingeniously recognised by Prof. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff as relating to the water-measurements which regulated the length of the speeches. This subject is apparently referred to both in the middle of col. 33 and at the bottom of col. 34 (see next fragment); hence this fragment, which is from the top of a column, may belong either to col. 34 or to col. 35. The same scholar has also seen that the remains of words in ll. 4, 7, 8 point to the subject which forms the matter of Harpocration's article διαμεμετρημένη ἡμέρα (see App. I, frag. 423), in which mention is made of the month Posideon. This quotation, however, is not verbal, and does not enable us to reconstruct the passage with certainty. The fourth fragment contains the bottom of col. 34, which is on one piece of papyrus with the left-hand bottom corner of col. 35.

COL. 35. The remains of this column consist of a strip containing the ends of the lines throughout, but in such a condition as to be practically undecipherable, and of another piece which contains the beginnings of the lines at the bottom of the column. In the latter it is possible to identify one of the extant quotations of Aristotle's work (Rose, *Frag.* 424), and the passage is accordingly reconstructed. The quotation occurs in Harpocration, *s.v.* τετρυπημένη, and it is prefaced by the words, Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ γράφει ταυτί. The only variation in the text is the addition of ἀμφοτέρας at the end of the quotation, which is a distinct improvement.

πλήρη, [φανερὰς ὁρᾶν τοῖς ἀντιδίκοις ἵ]να μή-
τε πλή[ρεις μήτε τετρυπημένας ἀμφο]τέρας
λαμβ[άνωσιν] . . . . [λ]αχω .
απολα . . . .
ψηφιζ . . . .
. . . . . τοῦ γ̄ ἀποδιδοὺς [γ]ὰρ γ̄ λαμβάνει . . ψηφι- [Col. 36.]
. . . . . πάντες. ο[ὐ γὰ]ρ ἔστι λα[μβάν]ει[ν] . . . ορον
[οὐδεν]ὶ ἐὰν μὴ ψηφίζηται. εἰσὶ [δ'] ἀμφορεῖς
[δύο κεί]μενοι ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ, ὁ μὲν χ[α]λκοῦς
[ὁ δὲ ξύ]λινος, διαιρετοὶ [ὅ]πως μὴ . . . . ὑπο[β]άλλων-
[ται] . . . εις εἰς οὓς ψηφίζονται οἱ δικασταί, ὁ μὲν
[χαλκοῦ]ς κύριος, ὁ δὲ ξύλινος ἄκυρ[ος]. ἔχε[ι δ' ὁ] χαλ-
[κοῦς ἐ]πίθημα διερρ[ινη]μένον ὥστ' αὐ[τ]ὴν
[μόνη]ν χωρεῖν τὴν ψῆφον, ἵνα [μ]ὴ δύο [ὁ] αὐτὸς
[βάλλ]ῃ. ἐπειδὰν δὲ διαψηφί[ζεσθαι] μέλ[λ]ωσιν
[δικασ]ταί, ὁ κῆρυξ ἀγορ[εύ]ει, πρῶτον ἂν ἐ[π]ισκή-

Col. 36. . . . *εις*: the reading is not certain, but it does not appear to be [*ψῆφο*]*ι*, as K-W. give it. 11. *δικασταί*: there does not appear to be room for the article in the lacuna. The final *ί* is faint but traceable. *ἂν*: so MS., not *ἵν'*, as K-W.; an apodosis is easily understood. *ἐπισκήπτωνται*: MS. *επισκε-*.

Col. 36. The greater part of the width of this column remains, but the writing is much rubbed in places, so that it is not easy to decipher connectedly. Two of the extant quotations, however, occur in it, which are of great assistance in restoring those parts of the text. For the rest of the column the restorations are mostly due to Prof. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff.

3. *ἀμφορεῖς*: this passage is quoted, with slight variation of language, by the scholiast on Aristoph. *Knights* 1150, . . *ὕστερον δὲ ἀμφορεῖς δύο ἵσταντο ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις, ὁ μὲν χαλκοῦς, ὁ δὲ ξύλινος· καὶ ὁ μὲν κύριος ἦν, ὁ δὲ ἄκυρος. ἔχει δὲ καὶ ὁ χαλκοῦς, ὥς φησιν Ἀριστοτέλης, διερρινημένον ἐπίθημα, εἰς τὸ αὐτὴν μόνην τὴν ψῆφον καθίεσθαι.* Pollux also (VIII. 123) draws from Aristotle, *ψήφους δ' εἶχον χαλκᾶς δύο, τετρυπημένην καὶ ἀτρύπητον, καὶ κάδον ᾧ κημὸς ἐπέκειτο δι' οὗ καθίετο ἡ ψῆφος· αὖθις δὲ δύο ἀμφορεῖς, ὁ μὲν χαλκοῦς, ὁ δὲ ξύλινος, ὁ μὲν κύριος, ὁ δὲ ἄκυρος· τῷ δὲ χαλκῷ ἐπῆν ἐπίθημα μίᾳ ψήφῳ χώραν ἔχον* (Rose, *Frag.* 426).

[πτων]ται οἱ ἀντίδικοι ταῖς μαρτυρίαις· [δε]ῖ γὰρ
[αὐτοὺς] ἐπισκήψασθαι [αὐ]τα[ῖ]ς πρὶν [π]άντα[ς] διαψη-
[φίσασ]θαι. ἔπειτα πάλιν [ὁ κῆρυξ κηρ]ύττ[ει], ἡ τε-
[τρυπη]μένη τοῦ πρ[ό]τερον [λέγοντ]ος, ἡ [δὲ] πλή-
[ρης το]ῦ ὕστερον λέγοντος . . . . . . ταστ . . στα
[πρόσθ]εν τοῦ λυχνείου τὰς ψήφους [ἐ]πὶ ἕ[κασ]τον
. . . . . τῆς ψήφου καὶ οὐ δεικνύων [τ]οῖς ἀ-
[γωνιζο]μένοις οὔτε τὸ τετρυπημέ[ν]ον
[οὔτε τὸ] πλῆρες ἐμβάλλει τὴν μὲν κυ[ρία]ν εἰς
[τὸν χαλ]κοῦν ἀμφορ[έ]α, τὴν δὲ ἄκυρο[ν] εἰς
[τὸν ξύλ]ινον . πλα . . . . α
. . . . . μενοι λαβεῖν τὰς . . . [ὑπ]ηρέται
τὸν ἀ]μφορέα τὸν κύριον . . . . ασι . . . ἀνὰ
[τὰ τρυ]πήματα ἔχοντα . . . [γ]άρ εἰσι[ν] αἱ ψῆ-
[φοι τὰ] αὐτὰ . . . αι . . ρ . . . . . ναπευ ἀ[ρ]ιθμοὶ
. . . . . ε καὶ τα . . . . . . [εἶ]τα [καὶ] τὰ πλήρη δηλ-
[οῖ τοῖς ἀν]τιδ[ί]κ[οις] οἱ . . . . . τη . . . . . . ους [ε]ἰλη-
[χότας] δια . . . . τας . . του α . ακασ
. . . . . με . . . . εις χ . . . . δε τὰς τε-
[τρυπη]μένας, καὶ ἀναγορεύ[ει] ὁ κῆρ[υξ] τὸν

12. *ταῖς μαρτυρίαις*: MS. *τας μαρτυριας*. 13. *αὐταῖς*: the reading is doubtful. 18. *οὐ*: read by Blass; not *ὁ*, as 1st ed. and K-W. 19, 20. *οὔτε . . . οὔτε*: so Blass. 20. *ἐμβάλλει*: MS. *βαλλει* with *εν* added above the line. *ἐμβάλλειν* is the regular word, *cf.* 55, l. 30, 63, ll. 7, 10, col. 31, l. 17. 25. The readings in this line are very doubtful.

17. The sense of this passage appears to be that some official takes two voting tablets, one of each sort, holds them up before a light, so as to show that one is pierced and the other not, and drops them into the urns to which they belong, so that the dicasts may clearly realise which pebble should be placed in which urn. But the precise readings are doubtful.

[ἀριθ]μὸν τῶν ψήφων, τοῦ μὲν [δ]ιώ[κον]τος τὰς τετρυπημένας, τοῦ δὲ φ[εύγον][τος τὰ]ς πλήρεις· ὁποτέρῳ δ' ἂν πλείω [γ]ένη[ται οὗ]τος νικᾷ. ἂν δὲ [ἴσαι], ὁ [φεύγων]. ἔ[πε]ιτα πά-

[Col. 37.]

λιν τιμῶσι, ἂν δέῃ τιμῆσαι, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ψηφιζόμενοι, τὸ μὲν σύμβολον ἀποδιδόντες, βακτηρίαν δὲ πάλιν παραλαμβάνοντες. ἡ δὲ τίμησίς ἐστιν πρὸς ἡμίχουν ὕδατος ἑκατέρῳ. ἐπειδὰν δὲ αὐτοῖς ᾖ δεδικασμένα τὰ ἐκ τῶν νόμων, ἀπολαμβάνουσιν τὸν μισθὸν ἐν τῷ μέρει οὗ ἔλαχον ἕκαστοι.

35. *νικᾷ* : MS. *νεικα.* COL. 37. 1. *τιμῶσι*: MS. *τειμωσι*, and so again below, *τειμησαι, τειμησις.* 5. *ἑκατέρῳ* : corrected in MS. from *εκατερων.*

32. *τῶν ψήφων*: this passage is quoted in the Lex. rhet. Cantabrig. p. 670, 30, *s. v. ἴσαι αἱ ψῆφοι αὐτῶν* : *ἐγένοντο δὲ ἴσαι ψῆφοι, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ· καὶ ἦσαν τοῦ μὲν διώκοντος αἱ τετρυπημέναι, τοῦ δὲ φεύγοντος αἱ πλήρεις· ὁποτέρῳ δ' ἂν πλείους γένωνται, οὗτος ἐνίκα· ὅτε δ' ἴσαι, ὁ φεύγων ἀπέφυγεν, ὡς καὶ Θεοδέκτης ἐν τῇ Σωκράτους ἀπολογίᾳ* (Rose, *Frag.* 425).

COL. 37. This column contains the final words of the treatise in good condition. It seems probable that this is actually the end of the work, though the fact of the writing breaking off in the middle of a column would not prove it, as that has already occurred in the cases of columns 24 and 30. But this time an elaborate flourish is executed, such as we find at the conclusion of other papyrus MSS., and the subject of the law-courts has been brought to completion. It is, no doubt, an abrupt ending, but it is not therefore uncharacteristic of Aristotle.

APPENDIX I.

FRAGMENTS OF THE Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία PREVIOUSLY KNOWN FROM QUOTATIONS IN OTHER AUTHORS[1].

343.

Harpocration *s.v.* Ἀπόλλων πατρῷος· ὁ Πύθιος. προσηγορία τίς ἐστι τοῦ θεοῦ πολλῶν καὶ ἄλλων οὐσῶν. τὸν δὲ Ἀπόλλωνα κοινῶς πατρῷον τιμῶσιν Ἀθηναῖοι ἀπὸ Ἴωνος· τούτου γὰρ οἰκήσαντος τὴν Ἀττικήν, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης φησί, τοὺς Ἀθηναίους Ἴωνας κληθῆναι καὶ Ἀπόλλω πατρῷον αὐτοῖς ὀνομασθῆναι.

Exc. Polit. Heraclid. § 1: Ἀθηναῖοι τὸ μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐχρῶντο βασιλείᾳ, συνοικήσαντος δὲ Ἴωνος αὐτοῖς, τότε πρῶτον Ἴωνες ἐκλήθησαν. Πάνδων (l. Πανδίων) δὲ βασιλεύσας μετὰ Ἐρεχθέα διένειμε τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῖς υἱοῖς. καὶ διετέλουν οὗτοι στασιάζοντες.

Frag. 343. This quotation is clearly from the opening of Aristotle's treatise, now lost. We know from the summary in ch. 41 that Aristotle took the establishment effected by Ion as the starting-point of the constitutional history of Athens, so that this passage probably occurred very near the beginning. The extract from the Πολιτεῖαι of Heraclides is given because that work was evidently a compilation from Aristotle (*cf.* note on ch. 18, l. 9). The first part of it, as far as ἐκλήθησαν, is given by Rose in his 1870 edition under no. 343; the rest, with the continuation of it quoted below (Frag. 346), in his 1886 edition under no. 611. A passage added in this place by him from a scholiast on Aristophanes has already been quoted in the note on ch. 3, l. 10.

---

[1] The quotation is given in full when the fragment does not occur in the MS. from which the present text is published. In other cases a reference is given to the chapter in which it is to be found and the note which mentions it. The numbers are, as before, those of the 1870 edition of Rose's collection in the Berlin Academy edition of Aristotle.

344.

Plinius, N. H., VII. 205: Gyges Lydus picturam Aegypti (condere instituit) et in Graecia Euchir Daedali cognatus, ut Aristoteli placet, ut Theophrasto, Polygnotus Atheniensis.

345.

See ch. 60, l. 7, and note on *τὸ ἔλαιον*.

346.

Plutarch, Thes. 25: *ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον αὐξῆσαι τὴν πόλιν βουλόμενος ἐκάλει πάντας ἐπὶ τοῖς ἴσοις, καὶ τὸ "δεῦρ' ἴτε πάντες λεῴ" κήρυγμα Θησέως γενέσθαι φασὶ πανδημίαν τινα καθιστάντος. οὐ μὴν ἄτακτον οὐδὲ μεμιγμένην περιεῖδεν ὑπὸ πλήθους ἐπιχυθέντος ἀκρίτου γενομένην τὴν δημοκρατίαν, ἀλλὰ πρῶτος ἀποκρίνας χωρὶς εὐπατρίδας καὶ γεωμόρους καὶ δημιουργούς, εὐπατρίδαις δὲ γινώσκειν τὰ θεῖα καὶ παρέχειν ἄρχοντας ἀποδοὺς καὶ νόμων διδασκάλους εἶναι καὶ ὁσίων καὶ ἱερῶν ἐξηγητάς, τοῖς ἄλλοις πολίταις ὥσπερ εἰς ἴσον κατέστησε, δόξῃ μὲν εὐπατριδῶν χρείᾳ δὲ γεωμόρων πλήθει δὲ δημιουργῶν ὑπερέχειν δοκούντων. ὅτι δὲ πρῶτος ἀπέκλινε πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης φησί, καὶ ἀφῆκε τὸ μοναρχεῖν, ἔοικε μαρτυρεῖν καὶ Ὅμηρος ἐν νεῶν καταλόγῳ μόνους Ἀθηναίους δῆμον προσαγορεύσας.*

Exc. Polit. Heraclid. § 1: *Θησεὺς δὲ ἐκήρυξε καὶ συνεβίβασε τούτους ἐπ' ἴσῃ καὶ ὁμοίᾳ μοίρᾳ. οὗτος ἐλθὼν εἰς Σκῦρον ἐτελεύτησεν ὠσθεὶς κατὰ πετρῶν ὑπὸ Λυκομήδους, φοβηθέντος μὴ σφετερίσηται τὴν νῆσον. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ὕστερον περὶ τὰ Μηδικὰ μετεκόμισαν αὐτοῦ τὰ ὀστᾶ. ἀπὸ δὲ Κοδριδῶν οὐκέτι βασιλεῖς ᾑροῦντο διὰ τὸ δοκεῖν τρυφᾶν καὶ μαλακοὺς γεγονέναι. Ἱππομένης δὲ εἷς τῶν Κοδριδῶν βουλόμενος ἀπώσασθαι τὴν διαβολήν, λαβὼν ἐπὶ τῇ θυγατρὶ Λειμώνῃ μοιχόν, ἐκεῖνον μὲν ἀνεῖλεν ὑποζεύξας μετὰ τῆς θυγατρὸς τῷ ἅρματι, τὴν δὲ ἵππῳ συνέκλεισεν ἕως ἀπόληται.*

Frag. 344. This quotation is given by Rose and is therefore included here, but it may be taken as nearly certain that it is not from the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*.

Frag. 346. It is impossible to tell for certain how much of this passage is taken from Aristotle, but we know that Plutarch made use of the latter's

347.

Schol. in Plat. Axioch. p. 465 (cf. Moeris att. p. 193, 16) *γεννήτη*: *Ἀριστοτέλης φησὶ τοῦ ὅλου πλήθους διῃρημένου Ἀθήνησιν εἴς τε τοὺς γεωργοὺς καὶ τοὺς δημιουργοὺς φυλὰς αὐτῶν εἶναι τέσσαρας, τῶν δὲ φυλῶν ἑκάστης μοίρας εἶναι τρεῖς, ἃς τριττύας τε καλοῦσι καὶ φρατρίας, ἑκάστης δὲ τούτων τριάκοντα εἶναι γένη, τὸ δὲ γένος ἐκ τριάκοντα ἕκαστον ἀνδρῶν συνεστάναι. τούτους δὴ τοὺς εἰς τὰ γένη τεταγμένους γεννήτας καλοῦσι.*

Lex. Demosth. Patm. p. 152, ed. Sakkelion, *γεννῆται: πάλαι τὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων πλῆθος, πρὶν ἢ Κλεισθένη διοικήσασθαι τὰ περὶ τὰς φυλάς, διῃρεῖτο εἰς γεωργοὺς καὶ δημιουργούς. καὶ φυλαὶ τούτων ἦσαν δʹ, τῶν δὲ φυλῶν ἑκάστη μοίρας εἶχε γʹ, ἃς φρατρίας καὶ τριττύας ἐκάλουν. τούτων δ' ἑκάστη συνειστήκει ἐκ τριάκοντα γενῶν καὶ γένος ἕκαστον ἄνδρας εἶχε τριάκοντα τοὺς εἰς τὰ γένη τεταγμένους, οἵτινες γεννῆται ἐκαλοῦντο, ὧν αἱ ἱερωσύναι ἑκάστοις*

work, and he evidently had it before him here, as he proceeds to mention him by name. In all probability the division of the people into Eupatridae, Geomori, and Demiurgi, with the description of their respective positions, may be ascribed to Aristotle's authority, in addition to the phrase which is actually quoted from him. In the summary in ch. 41 the rule of Theseus is taken to mark the first modification of the constitution in the direction of popular government.

Only the first sentence of the extract from Heraclides is given in Rose's 1870 edition. Hippomenes was the fourth of the decennial archons and the last of the descendants of Codrus who governed Athens, his period of rule ending in 723 B.C.

Frag. 347. The passage quoted by these various authors evidently comes from Aristotle's description of the constitution under Theseus, to whom was ascribed the division of the people into Eupatridae, Geomori, and Demiurgi. It is noticeable that alike in the scholiast to Plato, Moeris, and the Lexicon Demosthenicum the name of the Eupatridae is omitted, clearly pointing to a community of origin, which may have been either the text of Aristotle himself or of some compiler from him.

The Lexicon Demosthenicum appears to contain the fullest citation from Aristotle. The comparison of the numbers of the *φυλαί*, *φρατρίαι* and *γένη* to the seasons, months, and days is also found in Suidas, who must have drawn from the same source.

Harpocration appears also to have drawn from Aristotle in his account of the word *γεννῆται*, but he adds nothing to the quotations already given. The same is the case with Pollux (VIII. 111), but he does not follow Aristotle verbally.

προσήκουσαι ἐκληροῦντο, οἷον Εὐμολπίδαι καὶ Κήρυκες καὶ Ἐτεοβουτάδαι, ὡς ἱστορεῖ ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ Ἀριστοτέλης λέγων οὕτως. φυλὰς δὲ αὐτῶν συννενεμῆσθαι δ' ἀπομιμησαμένων τὰς ἐν τοῖς ἐνιαυτοῖς ὥρας. ἑκάστην δὲ διῃρῆσθαι εἰς τρία μέρη τῶν φυλῶν, ὅπως γένηται τὰ πάντα δώδεκα μέρη, καθάπερ οἱ μῆνες εἰς τὸν ἐνιαυτόν, καλεῖσθαι δὲ αὐτὰ τριττῦς καὶ φρατρίας. εἰς δὲ τὴν φρατρίαν τριάκοντα γένη διακεκοσμῆσθαι, καθάπερ αἱ ἡμέραι εἰς τὸν μῆνα, τὸ δὲ γένος εἶναι τριάκοντα ἀνδρῶν.

Harpocration *s.v.* τριττύς: τριττύς ἐστι τὸ τρίτον μέρος τῆς φυλῆς· αὕτη γὰρ διῄρηται εἰς τρία μέρη, τριττῦς καὶ ἔθνη καὶ φρατρίας, ὥς φησιν Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ.

348.

Servius ad Vergil. Georg. I. 19, uncique puer monstrator aratri: . . . vel Epimenides (significatur) qui postea Buzyges dictus est secundum Aristotelem.

Lex. rhet. Seg. p. 221, 8 *s.v.* Βουζυγία: γένος τι Ἀθήνησιν, ἱερωσύνην τινὰ ἔχον· Βουζύγης γάρ τις τῶν ἡρώων πρῶτος βοῦς ζεύξας τὴν γῆν ἤροσε καὶ εἰς γεωργίαν ἐπιτήδειον ἐποίησεν, ἀφ' οὗ γένος καλεῖται Βουζυγία.

349.

See ch. 8, l. 13, and note on φυλαὶ δ' ἦσαν.

350.

See ch. 7, l. 10, and note on τιμήματα.

351.

See ch. 2, l. 6, and note on πελάται.

352.

See ch. 7, l. 3, and note on ἀναγράψαντες.

353.

See ch. 8, l. 34, and note on νόμον ἔθηκε.

Frag. 348. If this quotation belongs to the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, it must come from the part in which Aristotle mentioned the families to which certain priestly functions appertained; *cf.* preceding fragment.

354.

Plutarch, Solon 32: ἡ δὲ δὴ διασπορὰ κατακαυθέντος αὐτοῦ (Σόλωνος) τῆς τέφρας περὶ τὴν Σαλαμινίων νῆσον ἔστι μὲν διὰ τὴν ἀτοπίαν ἀπίθανος παντάπασι καὶ μυθώδης, ἀναγέγραπται δ' ὑπό τε ἄλλων ἀνδρῶν ἀξιολόγων καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους τοῦ φιλοσόφου.

355.

See ch. 15, l. 16, and note on τὴν ἐπὶ Παλληνίδι μάχην.

356.

See ch. 19, l. 15, and note on Λειψύδριον.

357.

See ch. 19, l. 15, and note on Λειψύδριον.

358.

See ch. 19, l. 49, and note on ἑνὸς δεῖν πεντήκοντα.

359.

See ch. 21, l. 24, and note on κατέστησε.

360.

See ch. 23, l. 5, and note on διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι.

361.

See ch. 23, l. 5, and note on διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι.

362.

See ch. 30, l. 17, and note on ἑλληνοταμίας.

363.

See ch. 27, l. 20, and note on Λακιαδῶν.

Frag. 354. Plutarch does not state that this quotation is from the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, and it is a story which may have been alluded to in any other work almost as well.

364.

Plutarch, Pericl. 4: Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ παρὰ Πυθοκλείδῃ μουσικὴν διαπονηθῆναι τὸν ἄνδρα φησὶν (τὸν Περικλέα).

365.

See ch. 27, l. 24, and note on συμβουλεύσαντος.

366.

See ch. 25, l. 14, and note on συναιτίου.

367.

See ch. 25, l. 31, and note on δι' Ἀριστοδίκου.

368.

See ch. 28, l. 23, and note on περιζωσάμενος.

369.

See ch. 28, l. 38, and note on Νικίας.

370.

See ch. 34, l. 13, and note on ὑπὸ Κλεοφῶντος.

371.

See ch. 27, l. 32, and note on Ἀνύτου.

372.

See ch. 33, l. 1, and note on μῆνας.

373.

See ch. 34, l. 35, and note on Δρακοντίδης.

374.

See ch. 55, l. 7, and note on πρῶτον μέν.

375.

See ch. 55, ll. 7 and 37, and notes on πρῶτον μέν and ὀμνύουσιν.

Frag. 364. It is evident that this quotation is out of keeping with the character of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία and may well have been taken from some other work.

376.

Pollux, III. 17: ὁ δὲ πάππου ἢ τήθης πατὴρ πρόπαππος· . . . τάχα δ' ἂν τοῦτον τριτοπάτορα Ἀριστοτέλης καλοῖ.

377.

See ch. 55, l. 34, and note on πρὸς τὸν λίθον.

378.

See ch. 59, l. 1, and note on οἱ δὲ θεσμοθέται.

379.

See ch. 59, l. 9, and note on εἰσὶ δὲ καί.

380.

See ch. 59, l. 20, and note on τὰ σύμβολα.

381.

See ch. 56, ll. 14 and 36, and notes on Θαργήλια and γραφαί.

382.

See ch. 56, l. 47, and note on εἰς ἐμφανῶν κατάστασιν.

383.

See ch. 56, l. 45, and note on εἰς δατητῶν αἵρεσιν.

384.

See ch. 56, l. 57, and note on σῖτον.

385.

See ch. 57, ll. 4 and 10, and notes on Διονυσίων and γραφαί.

386.

See ch. 57, l. 1, and note on ὁ δὲ βασιλεύς.

387.

See ch. 58, l. 1, and note on ὁ δὲ πολέμαρχος.

Frag. 376. As the word τριτοπάτωρ does not occur in the θεσμοθετῶν ἀνάκρισις, to which Rose no doubt imagined it to belong, there is no reason to suppose that it is taken from the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία at all.

388.

See ch. 58, l. 10, and note on *αὐτὸς δ' εἰσάγει.*

389.

See ch. 56, l. 1, and note on *λαμβάνουσι.*

390.

See ch. 61, l. 2, and note on *στρατηγούς.*

391.

See ch. 61, l. 23, and note on *ἱππάρχους.*

392.

See ch. 61, l. 28, and note on *φυλάρχους.*

393.

See ch. 43, l. 8, and note on *πρυτανεύει.*

394.

See ch. 43, l. 14, and note on *συνάγουσιν.*

395.

See ch. 43, ll. 14 and 19, and notes on *συνάγουσιν* and *προγράφουσι.*

396.

See ch. 43, l. 19, and note on *προγράφουσι.*

397.

See ch. 44, l. 1, and note on *ἐπιστάτης.*

398.

See ch. 44, l. 10, and note on *προέδρους.*

399.

See ch. 54, ll. 16 and 24, and notes on *γραμματέα* and *ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους.*

400.

See ch. 48, l. 2, and note on *παραλαβόντες.*

401.

See ch. 47, l. 8, and note on πωληταί.

402.

See ch. 47, l. 6, and note on παραλαμβάνουσι, and ch. 61, l. 32, and note on ταμίαν τῆς Παράλου.

403.

See ch. 61, l. 32, and note on ταμίαν τῆς Παράλου.

404.

See ch. 54, l. 29, and note on ἱεροποιούς.

405.

See ch. 48, l. 18, and note on εὐθύνους.

406.

See ch. 54, l. 3, and note on λογιστάς.

407.

See ch. 54, l. 3, and note on λογιστάς.

408.

See ch. 50, l. 4, and note on ἀστυνόμοι.

409.

See ch. 51, l. 1, and note on ἀγορανόμοι.

410.

See ch. 51, l. 16, and note on ἐμπορίου ἐπιμελητάς.

411.

See ch. 51, l. 8, and note on σιτοφύλακες.

412.

See ch. 51, l. 5, and note on μετρονόμοι.

413.

See ch. 53, l. 1, and note on τετταράκοντα.

414.

See ch. 53, l. 7, and note on τοῖς διαιτηταῖς.

415.

See ch. 53, l. 13, and note on *ἐχίνους*.

416.

Pollux, VIII. 62: *ἔφεσις δέ ἐστιν ὅταν τις ἀπὸ διαιτητῶν ἢ ἀρχόντων ἢ δημοτῶν ἐπὶ δικαστὴν ἐφῇ, ἢ ἀπὸ βουλῆς ἐπὶ δῆμον, ἢ ἀπὸ δήμου ἐπὶ δικαστήριον, ἢ ἀπὸ δικαστῶν ἐπὶ ξενικὸν δικαστήριον· ἐφέσιμος δ' ὠνομάζετο ἡ δίκη. αὗται δὲ καὶ ἔκκλητοι δίκαι ἐκαλοῦντο. τὸ δὲ παρακαταβαλλόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν ἐφέσεων, ὅπερ οἱ νῦν παραβόλιον καλοῦσι, παράβολον Ἀριστοτέλης λέγει.*

417.

See ch. 57, l. 20, and note on *τῶν δ' ἀκουσίων*.

418.

See ch. 57, l. 20, and note on *τῶν δ' ἀκουσίων*.

419.

See ch. 57, l. 25, and note on *ἐπὶ Δελφινίῳ*.

420.

See Fragments, col. 32, l. 8, and note on *τοῖς γὰρ δικαστηρίοις*.

421.

See ch. 62, l. 9, and note on *τὰ δικαστήρια*.

422.

See note on ch. 28, l. 26, *τὴν διωβελίαν*.

423.

Harpocration *s. v. διαμεμετρημένη ἡμέρα: μέτρον τί ἐστιν ὕδατος πρὸς μεμετρημένον ἡμέρας διάστημα ῥέον. ἐμετρεῖτο δὲ*

Frag. 416. If this citation is from the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, which is in itself probable enough, it presumably comes from the discussion on legal procedure, which is imperfect in the MS.

Frag. 423. This passage belongs to col. 34 or col. 35 of the Fragments; see note on p. 200.

τῷ Ποσειδεῶνι μηνί. πρὸς δὴ τοῦτο ἠγωνίζοντο οἱ μέγιστοι καὶ περὶ τῶν μεγίστων ἀγῶνες. διενέμετο δὲ εἰς τρία μέρη τὸ ὕδωρ, τὸ μὲν τῷ διώκοντι, τὸ δὲ τῷ φεύγοντι, τὸ δὲ τρίτον τοῖς δικάζουσι. ταῦτα δὲ σαφέστατα αὐτοὶ οἱ ῥήτορες δεδηλώκασιν . . . Ἀριστοτέλης δ' ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ διδάσκει περὶ τούτων.

424.

See Fragments, col. 35, and note.

425.

See Fragments, col. 36, l. 32, and note on *τῶν ψήφων*.

426.

See Fragments, col. 36, l. 3, and note on *ἀμφορεῖς*.

427.

See ch. 42, l. 5, and note on *διαψηφίζονται*.

428.

See ch. 42, l. 38, and note on *ἐκκλησίας*.

429.

See ch. 53, l. 27, and note on *δύο δὲ καὶ τετταράκοντα*.

430.

See ch. 49, l. 29, and note on *τοὺς ἀδυνάτους*.

431.

See ch. 56, l. 22, and note on *δεῖ γάρ*.

In the latest edition of Rose (1886) two additional passages are cited, viz. :—

413 (1886).

See ch. 3, ll. 28 and 38, and notes on *ᾤκησαν* and *κύριοι δ' ἦσαν*.

429 (1886).

See ch. 52, l. 4, and note on *ὁμολογῶσι*.

APPENDIX II.

IT has been mentioned in the Introduction, p. xi, and in the note to ch. 25, l. 6, that in the middle of the tenth column of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία the sequence of the text is broken by a column and a half of alien matter. This is written in the opposite direction to the Aristotle, and was evidently inscribed on the papyrus at an earlier date. It occupies what was at that time the extremity of the first roll of the papyrus, and is immediately at the back of the beginning of the accounts on the *recto*. Subsequently the transcriber of the Aristotle affixed an additional piece of papyrus, on which the eleventh column of the Ἀ. π. is now written; the *recto* of this is blank. The writing of the fragment now in question is not in the same hand as any of those which wrote the Aristotle, but is of the same date, and is in general character akin to the first and fourth hands. Many of the same contractions are employed, *viz*. μ′, μ\`, δ′, τ\`, τʼ, τ′, π\`, π′, κ′, κ\`, /, //, σ′, ο′, γ′, while the symbol for *αὐτός* and its cases (ϟ), which occurs once in the Aristotle and frequently in the accounts on the *recto*, is found repeatedly here. Words are also frequently abbreviated by the omission of terminations, *e.g.* δημοσιω for δημοσίων, Τιμαρ^{χ} for Τιμάρχου, τυ^{χ} for τυχεῖν, αρ^{γ} for ἀργύριον.

A transcript of the text is here given. The contents are a short argument to the speech of Demosthenes against Meidias, and explanatory notes on phrases in the first eleven sections of the speech. Presumably the writer

intended to transcribe a complete commentary on the speech, but never completed it; and the scribe of the Aristotle, on coming to this part of the papyrus, crossed it out roughly and passed on. The introductory remarks contain a reference to a statement by Καικίλιος, i.e. Caecilius Calactinus, a rhetor of the age of Augustus, who wrote various works relating to the Greek orators, including one on the authenticity of the speeches of Demosthenes; and in the notes there is a quotation from the grammarian Didymus.

This text has already been published in the edition of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία by van Herwerden and van Leeuwen, having been transcribed by the latter from the facsimile of the MS. This transcript has been used in the revision of the present version, and in some cases it has lightened the labour of decipherment. On the other hand the facsimile has occasionally led the Dutch scholar into error, as was inevitable. Where the MS. reading is clear, it has not been thought worth while to record variant readings which merely represent a misreading of the facsimile; but where there is any doubt the variations are mentioned.

References are made to the sections in Blass' 4th edition of the Teubner text of Demosthenes (Leipzig, 1888).

Μειδίας εἰς τὰ μάλιστα ἐχθρὸς ἦν τῷ Δημοσθένει, καὶ διὰ πολλῶν μὲν καὶ ἄλλων ἐνεδείξατο εἰς αὐτὸν τὴν ἔχθραν, καί ποτε χορηγὸν ὄντα αὐτὸν τῆς Πανδιονίδος φυλῆς ἐν μέσῃ τῇ ὀρχήστρᾳ κονδύλοις ἔλαβεν. ὁ δὲ ἐγράψατο αὐτὸν δημοσίων ἀδικημάτων, συμπεριλαβὼν τοῖς δημοσίοις ἀδικήμασι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ὕβριν· ἐπεὶ ἐξῆν ἐκείνῳ λέγειν ὅτι "ὑβρίσθης· λαβὲ τῆς ὕβρεως τὸ πρόστιμον." ἔχει δ' ἡ ὑπόθεσις κατὰ μὲν Καικίλιον δύο κεφάλαια, εἰ δημόσιόν ἐστιν ἀδίκημα, καὶ εἰ μεγάλα τὰ πεπραγμένα ἐστίν. προσθετέον δὲ κἀκεῖνο, εἰ ὕβρις ἐστὶν ἡ γενομένη· ὅπερ ἀθετεῖ

4. *ἔλαβεν*: the *β* is partly lost in a crack in the papyrus, but it is tolerably certain that this is the reading, not *ἔταξεν*, as H-L. read, emending it to *ἐπάταξεν*. The symbol for *αὐτόν* is prefixed to the verb in the MS., but has been struck out.

ὁ δέ: the reading is not quite certain.

Καικίλιος, κακῶς· ἔσται γὰρ ἐναντίως αὐτῷ γεγραμμένον τὸ προοίμιον καὶ ἡ τοῦ χρυσοχόου μαρτυρία. ὅτι δὲ δῆλός ἐστι συμπεριλαβὼν τοῖς δημοσίοις ἀδικήμασι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ὕβριν ἐξ ἐκείνου φανερόν, ὅταν λέγῃ, "ἐπειδὰν ἐπιδείξω Μειδίαν τοῦτον μὴ μόνον εἰς ἐμὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς ὑμᾶς καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἄλλους ἅπαντας ὑβρικότα," καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς. αἱ δ' ὑποθέσεις ὅταν μὴ ἔχωσιν ζητήματα μηδ' ἀμφισβητήσεις λελυμέναι εἰσί, καὶ τόπον τῷ ῥήτορι οὐ καταλείπουσι· οἷον περὶ φόνου τις ἐγκαλεῖται καὶ λέγει "ἀπέκτεινα μὲν τὸν δεῖνα, δικαίως δέ," τότε ὁμολογήσαντος αὐτοῦ τὸν φόνον ζητεῖται πότερα δικαίως ἢ ἀδίκως ἀπέκτεινε· ὅταν δὲ λέγῃ ὁ ἐγκαλούμενος ὅτι ἀπέκτεινε καὶ ἀδίκως ἀπέκτεινε, τότε λέλυται ἡ ὑπόθεσις. οὕτως καὶ περὶ ταύτης τῆς ὕβρεως ῥηθήσεται.

τὴν μὲν ἀσέλγειαν ὦ, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς (§ 1): Σελγοὶ ἔθνος ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰταλίας, δίκαιον καὶ ὅσιον· οἱ οὖν παραβαίνοντες τὸ δίκαιον εἰκότως ἂν κληθεῖεν ἀσελγεῖς. ταῦτα μὲν Δίδυμος λέγει· τινὲς δὲ λέγουσιν ὅτι, "πῶς περὶ δημοσίων ἀδικημάτων ὄντος τοῦ ἀγῶνος λέγει *καὶ τὴν ὕβριν*;" ἐπιλύεται οὖν αὐτὸς ἐπιφέρων ὅτι, ᾗ *πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀεὶ χρῆται Μειδίας*, ὡς καθολικῶς ὑβριστοῦ πρὸς πάντας ὄντος.

καὶ προὐβαλόμην ἀδικεῖν τουτονί (§ 1): προὐβαλόμην· εἰς δίκην κατέστησα. ἀδικεῖν· περὶ τὴν ἑορτήν. προβολὴ γὰρ

11. *μαρτυρία*: after this word the following words have been erased in the MS.: *δημοσιων αδικηματων ουκ οφειλε*.

13. *ἐπειδὰν κ.τ.λ.*: Dem. *contr. Meid.* § 7: the MSS. of Demosthenes read *ἔπειτ' ἐάν*, and *τουτονί*: the latter letter may possibly be lost in a crack of the papyrus.

14. *εἰς ὑμᾶς*: MSS. of Dem. add *καὶ εἰς τοὺς νόμους*.

19. *ἀπέκτεινε*: MS. *απεκτεινα*.

20. *ὅτι ἀπέκτεινε*: MS. at first *ὅτι ἀπέκτεινα*, but corrected.

21. *καὶ περὶ ταύτης*: the MS. is doubtful, except as to the last three letters. H-L. *αὐτῆς*.

22. *Σελγοὶ ἔθνος*: corrected above the line to *σελγος πολις*.

23. *Ἰταλίας*: MS. apparently *ιταλ*; H-L. [*ασι*]^{8}, but the MS. will not admit it.

δίκαιον καὶ ὅσιον: corrected to *δικαίων καὶ ὁσίων*, in accordance with the change in l. 22.

24. *κληθεῖεν*: MS. apparently *κληθειαν*.

μέν: MS. *δ'*, not *μ'* as given by H-L., but the correction seems necessary.

26. *αὐτός*: MS. *αυτο*, corrected by H-L.

27. *ὅτι*: the MS. is doubtful; possibly *ωι* erased. H-L. *ἔτι*.

29. *τουτονί*: MSS. of Dem. *τοῦτον*.

κυρίως ἡ μετὰ Διονύσια δίκη ἡ γινομένη περὶ τῶν ἡμαρτημένων ἐν τοῖς Διονυσίοις, μεταφορικῶς δ' ἐπὶ πάσης δίκης.

εἰς τὰς οὐσίας τὰς τούτων οὐδ' εἰς τὰς ὑποσχέσεις (§ 2): ὡς δωροδοκούντων.

ἐπειδή τις εἰσάγει (§ 3): δηλονότι ὁ ὑπηρέτης· οὐ γὰρ χωρὶς τούτου ἐξῆν τοῖς λέγουσιν εἰσελθεῖν.

πολλὰ μὲν χρήματ' ἐξόν μοι λαβεῖν, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς (§ 3): τοῦτο ὡς δικαίως ἀγωνιζόμενος καὶ μὴ ἀργύριον εἰληφώς· ὅμως δὲ χιλίας λαβὼν καθυφείκατο τὴν δίκην, ὡς ἐν τῇ ἱστορίᾳ φέρεται.

πολλὰς δὲ δεήσεις καὶ χάριτας καὶ νὴ Δία ἀπειλὰς ὑπομείνας (§ 3): εἰκότως, ἃ συμβαίνει τοῖς παρακαλοῦσι καὶ ἐν ὀργῇ πᾶσι γινομένοις.

εἰ μὲν οὖν παρανόμων ἢ παραπρεσβείας ἤ τινος ἄλλης τοιαύτης ἔμελλον αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς (§ 5): εἰκότως· οἱ γὰρ περὶ ἰδίων πρᾳγμάτων ἀγωνιζόμενοι ὀφείλουσιν οἰκτίζεσθαι εἰς τὸ ἐλέου τινὸς τυχεῖν, οἱ δὲ περὶ δημοσίων αὐτὸ μόνον λέγειν καὶ ἐνδεικνύναι, ὡς τοῦ δήμου ἀκούοντος καὶ ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ ἀγωνιουμένου.

προπηλακισμός (§ 7): πληγή.

ὁ μὲν νόμος οὗτός ἐστιν ὦ, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς (§ 9): τὸ εἶδος τοῦτο πρόθεσις λέγεται, ὅταν ὁ ῥήτωρ τὸ πρᾶγμα περὶ οὗ λέγει ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων αὐξάνῃ· ὥσπερ καὶ Αἰσχίνης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Τιμάρχου, περὶ ἑταιρήσεως οὔσης τῆς δίκης, ἀντιπαρατέθεικε τοὺς τῆς εὐκοσμίας νόμους. ὅμοιον κἂν εἴ τις περὶ ἱεροσύλου λέγων αὐξάνῃ τὸ ἁμάρτημα ἐγκωμιάσας τὸ θεῖον, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Δημοσθένης πρῶτον τὸν περὶ αὐτῶν τῶν Διονυσίων νόμον ἀνέγνω, δεύτερον δὲ τὸν περὶ τῆς ὕβρεως, ἐπιδεικνὺς ὅτι καὶ τοὺς ἐκ καταδίκης εἰσπραττομένους καὶ ὀφείλοντας ἀνυβρίστους ἀνίησιν ταύτας τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν Διονυσίων. ὅπου δὲ τιμωρίας ἄξιοί εἰσιν οἱ ὑβρίσαντες τοὺς

33. *οὐδ' εἰς*: MSS. of Dem. *οὐδέ*.

38. *τοῦτο*: MS. apparently *τουτ*; H-L. *ταῦτα*.

40. *νὴ Δία*: added above the line. The second column begins with the word *εἰκότως*.

42. *πᾶσι γινομένοις*: *γινομένοις* is certain, but the last two letters of *πᾶσι* are doubtful; H-L. *διαλεγομένοις*.

43. *ἤ τινος ἄλλης τοιαύτης*: MSS. of Dem. add *αἰτίας*, and Blass brackets *ἄλλης*.

59. *τῶν Διονυσίων*: removed by H-L. as a gloss, unnecessarily.

κατακρίτους, πόσῳ οἱ μὴ τοὺς κατακρίτους ἀλλ' ἐλευθέρους ὑβρίσαντες ;

Πάνδια (§ 9): ἑορτή.

ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ δίκῃ καὶ ψήφῳ τῶν ἑλόντων γινόμενα τῶν ἑαλωκότων (§ 11): ὃ λέγει τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν· ἃ καὶ τῶν νικησάντων δίκῃ γινόμενα τῶν νικηθέντων δεδώκατε ταύτην τὴν ἑορτήν.

60. **πόσῳ**: H-L. add μᾶλλον, which is an improvement.

62. **Πάνδια**: MS. πανδεια.

65. **νικηθέντων**: H-L. add εἶναι.

INDEX.

THE END.

Oxford
PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
BY HORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY